

157
L-2
C-1
125
COPY

✓
HEARING

OF THE

ASSEMBLY INTERIM COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

---oOo---

-- SUB-COMMITTEE --

HIGHER EDUCATION BEYOND THE TWELFTH GRADE

---oOo---

Held in
Room M-100, Music Hall
Fresno State College
Fresno, California

---oOo---

Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Thursday, August 14, 1958

VOLUME II

PAGES 152 - 316



DO NOT REMOVE FROM ROOM
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE
SERVICE

1 HEARING
2 OF THE
3 ASSEMBLY INTERIM COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
4 ---oOo---
5 - SUB-COMMITTEE -
6 HIGHER EDUCATION BEYOND THE TWELFTH GRADE.
7 ---oOo---
8 Held in
9 Room M-100, Music Hall
10 Fresno State College
11 Fresno, California
12 ---oOo---
13
14
15 Presiding: HAROLD T. SEDGWICK, Chairman
16 Thursday, August 14, 1958
17 10:00 o'clock a.m.
18
19 • Fresno, California
20
21
22 ---oOo---
23
24
25
26

1 ASSEMBLY INTERIM COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

2 - SUB-COMMITTEE -

3 HIGHER EDUCATION BEYOND THE TWELFTH GRADE.

4
5 ---oOo---

6 FRESNO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AUGUST 14, 1958 - 10:00 A.M.

7 ---oOo---

8 The Hearing in the Matter of ESTABLISHING A SEPARATE
9 STATE BOARD FOR THE GOVERNING OF THE STATE COLLEGES, called
10 in accordance with the provisions of House Resolutions 280
11 and 285 of the 1957 SESSION OF THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE.

12 ---oOo---

---oOo---

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

HAROLD T. SEDGWICK, Chairman	Oroville
DON J. DOYLE, Assemblyman	LaFayette
DOROTHY DONOHOE, Assemblywoman	Bakersfield
DON ANDERSON, Assemblyman	Monterey Park
RICHARD HANNA, Assemblyman	Westminster
SHERIDAN HEGLAND, Assemblyman	La Mesa
LOU CUSANOVITCH, Assemblyman	Van Nuys
JOHN COLLIER, Assemblyman	Los Angeles
BRUCE ALLEN, Assemblyman	San Jose

MARY LYNN LEY, Official Shorthand Reporter, was present and acting. The following proceedings were had and the following testimony was taken, to wit:

---oOo---

V O L U M E I II N D E X

<u>Item</u>	<u>Page</u>
Morning Session	152
Opening Statement-- Assemblyman Hegland	159
Jess E. Rodman	161
Clinton Jordan	176
James Whitsell	204
Floyd Clouse	213
Afternoon Session	215
Assemblyman Collier	215
Roy Stevens	221
Patterson Goodrich	240
Arthur J. Misner	242
G. A. McCallum	265
John W. McElheney	265
Dean Cresap	272
Ross Y. Koen	280
N. Field Winn	283
Victor L. Jepsen	286
Thompson Black	288
Jeannie Ellen Ferguson	289
John A. Spangler	289
Leo McClatchy	292

VOLUME IIINDEX (Cont'd)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Page</u>
Leonard Cain	295
George Appleton	298
E. F. DeVilbiss	303
Milo Rowe	306

---oOo---

VOLUME IIINDEXMEETINGS AND ADJOURNMENTS

<u>Item</u>	<u>Page</u>
Morning Session -- meeting	159
Morning Session -- adjournment	214
Afternoon Session -- meeting	215
Afternoon Session -- adjournment	312

V O L U M E I II N D E XS T A T E M E N T S

<u>Item</u>	<u>Page</u>
Statement by Richard H. Wilder Long Beach State College	313
Statement by George W. Korber Long Beach State College	314
Statement by V. A. Metzger Long Beach State College	315

FRESNO, CALIFORNIA

AUGUST 14, 1958, AT 10:00 O'CLOCK A.M.

---oOo---

PROCEEDINGS

---oOo---

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: The meeting will please come to order. We are a little late in getting started, but we will try and get along with our testimony this morning so we can get finished up.

First of all, I want to call on Assemblyman Hegland, who has an observation he would like to make at this time.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: Well, Chairman Sedgwick, as you know, I asked for time to make a 10-minute presentation, which I am not going to make because it is apparent that before this meeting is over, and possibly at the later hearing also, there will be all sorts of plans offered, and they should better come from others than from members of the Committee.

I do hope, though, that we will have, possibly at the future meeting, or at least it should be pointed out that the public schools of California, the elementary and secondary schools also have a stake in this matter, and it might be that all the elected officials in all the various local school boards feel that the coordination function of our elementary and secondary schools deserves, itself, a full-time board.

I think we have been looking at this matter from the point of view of higher education and forgetting, certainly,

1 the responsibility of equal weight, the impact of this on
2 elementary and secondary schools.

3 I was very happy that the expert who testified for us
4 yesterday morning pointed out that in the very few isolated
5 cases in which one board served both the elementary and second-
6 dary schools and higher education, that it was the public
7 schools who were apparently injured by this unfortunate
8 bracketing.

9 I will skip the presentation, and I am very grateful to
10 you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Marshall, for putting me on the
11 agenda. Thank you very much.

12 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you very much, Assemblyman
13 Hegland, for those observations.

14 At this time, I would like to introduce to the group
15 Assemblyman Bruce Allen. Assemblyman Allen is author of
16 882, the bill that we have been talking about. He also has
17 been a member of the Education Committee for several years,
18 and is what I call a veteran legislator.

19 We are very glad to have you with us, Mr. Allen. We will
20 hear from you later.

21 ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Now, our next witness will be Mr.
23 Rodman, of Fresno. He is Chairman of Fresno State College
24 Advisory Board.

25 Mr. Rodman.

26 ---oOo---

JESS E. RODMAN,

1
2 appeared as a witness before the Sub-Committee and testified
3 as follows, to wit:

4 MR. RODMAN: I consider it a pleasure to appear before
5 this group this morning on behalf of what I think is a matter
6 of great consequence.

7 I have visited with many folks regarding the problem at
8 hand and feel that I am quite well informed on the original
9 proposal to set up a separate board to administer State col-
10 leges, and also, a more recent proposal to enlarge the Board
11 of Education and have a separate administrator under them,
12 operating the State colleges.

13 I do definitely go along with the latter proposal that
14 the Board of Education be enlarged and an administrator ap-
15 pointed to head up the State colleges under their administra-
16 tion.

17 I come to this conclusion because, for a long time, I
18 have felt that the State colleges, in their administration,
19 didn't have sufficient autonomy to do a good job. They were
20 bound by too many restrictions, too many procedures that they
21 had to go through to get things accomplished, and I have felt
22 that they are operating under a considerable handicap.

23 I think they need more autonomy.

24 One of the reasons that I like the more recent proposal
25 is that I feel that every group needs to account to somebody;
26 there must be a certain amount of accountability. I have often

1 said in my business experience that everyone needs a boss, not
2 to direct his activities in detail, but someone to whom he
3 must account. When you know you are going to have to account
4 to somebody for your actions, I have found you do a better
5 job.

6 Under this latter proposal, I think the accountability
7 would be, of course, to the Board of Education. They don't
8 have time to give detailed supervision to the State colleges
9 or any one particular group. Their job is a big one, but
10 through an administrator selected and appointed by them and
11 operating closely with the presidents of the various State
12 colleges and the other people that they would be concerned
13 with, I believe an excellent job could be done with very little
14 work except top supervision work on the part of the Board of
15 Education, State Board.

16 Now, I am in favor of this latter proposal. The rela-
17 tions shouldn't be so that they would stifle initiative and
18 good judgment on the part of the administrators of various
19 State colleges, or the overall direction of the State colleges.

20 I think the accountability factor is important because
21 if you are too autonomous, the very fact that you are invites,
22 sometimes, suspicion, sometimes criticism that is unwanted.
23 It invites that sort of thing and you get more of it than,
24 perhaps, is warranted.

25 Briefly, that covers my thinking in regards to this new
26 proposal as against the old. I am sure that we need one or

1 the other. We shouldn't be asked -- the State colleges -- to
2 continue on as they have in the past, and having weighed and
3 considered both of them, I think the second proposal, and I
4 think you understand what I mean by that, is, perhaps, the
5 one to be preferred.

6 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Rodman, I assume from your tes-
7 timony that you were in favor of a separate Board for State
8 colleges until this new proposal was brought forth?

9 A. Very much so, yes.

10 Q. You feel now that, probably, this new proposal would
11 be satisfactory to the State colleges?

12 A. I feel so, and one of the reasons I feel so is that
13 it would keep the State college programs coordinated in the
14 overall State Educational Program. The very fact that all
15 your State College Presidents are pretty much for it would
16 indicate that they, too, would be satisfied and that, I will
17 admit, influences me.

18 Q. Now, even with the rapid growth of our State colleges
19 and what we must look forward to in the future, you still
20 feel that the last proposal by Dr. Simpson would be satisfac-
21 tory for many years to come?

22 A. Yes, I do. The proposal provides for an administra-
23 tor over all of them, and it does keep a sufficient autonomy
24 working under the Board. The Board are the people you must
25 account to. So you have your boss, top level, and then you
26 have a man with sufficient latitude and contacts with the

1 things that he is doing, a full-time job. I think, regardless
2 of the development in State college sizes and numbers, that
3 you could get excellent administration.

4 Q. Now, I might just make this observation: As Chairman
5 of this Committee, I am open-minded on this subject. I have
6 no definite opinion, as yet, but, as we go along in this hear-
7 ing, I just wonder if the State College Presidents really feel
8 that this proposal would be as satisfactory as a separate
9 Board.

10 A. Well, I attempted to learn that from Dr. Joyal and
11 the State College Presidents I visited regarding it. My first
12 suspicion was that maybe they were accepting something that
13 they figured was the best they could get and not necessarily
14 what they wanted. I gathered from what I have read and visit-
15 ing with him that they sincerely favor this arrangement.

16 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Of course, I feel this way about it:
17 If we are going to make any changes, I feel that we should put
18 forth every effort to make the right change. I don't think
19 we should be doing patch work, I think we should be doing what
20 we feel is going to be the best for the State colleges in years
21 to come.

22 In my observation, I believe that the State colleges are
23 just starting to grow and in another 15 or 20 years, they will
24 have twice as many students as they have now. As Assemblyman
25 Hegland said, I think we have to consider the elementary and
26 secondary schools, too. I think that whatever we arrive at

1 after this hearing should be something that is going to carry
2 on for a number of years.

3 Are there any other questions?

4 Mr. Doyle.

5 ASSEMBLYMAN DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, members, perhaps the
6 members of the Committee don't realize that Mr. Rodman has
7 spent his lifetime as a civic leader here in Fresno. I have
8 known him for 25 years, and he certainly has the interest of
9 this State College and the others at heart.

10 We agree pretty much, Mr. Rodman, in the appointed
11 Superintendent. I say "we", I know I have and the other
12 members of the Committee for a long, long time, but if you add
13 just one more member to the State Board, making the Superin-
14 tendent appointed, he would not only have the State colleges
15 to worry about, to work out their problems, but all other
16 phases of education. Wouldn't we have just a little more of
17 the same that we have now?

18 I feel very strongly, and, unlike Mr. Sedgwick, I do have
19 a position. I favor the former, more original thinking of
20 a separate State College Board to give the State Colleges of
21 California the recognition, number one, that they should have,
22 including the professors and those in the colleges and men
23 like yourself have spent many, many hours of your own time
24 on it, that they would be in a better position to administer
25 and to teach, to build and to grow under a separate board
26 than they would with this tie-in.

1 Here, again, it isn't a matter of taking anything away
2 from the Department. All of the Board members testified yes-
3 terday that they didn't have time to do the job; that they
4 only meet six times a year, and that it took them three or
5 four years, sometimes, to learn what it was all about.

6 I think we might be asking for more trouble and more
7 problems, and to me, the proposal that has been made is that
8 half a loaf that we always talk about in Sacramento, well,
9 a half a loaf is better than none at all.

10 I agree with Mr. Sedgwick that we should try to get the
11 whole loaf this time and then go along and try to do the job
12 with the colleges and those concerned in working with them,
13 particularly, the children that will be attending them here
14 in the future.

15 That is the only statement that I have to make.

16 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Allen.

17 QUESTIONS BY ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN:

18 Q. Mr. Rodman, you said you are Chairman of the Fresno
19 State College Advisory Board?

20 A. Right.

21 Q. How long have you been on that Board?

22 A. Oh, I believe it is about five or six years.

23 Q. And do you spend most of your time on that or do you
24 have a business to operate?

25 A. I have businesses that I operate. I try to spend
26 whatever time is necessary.

1 Q. Just exactly what do you do on the Advisory Board?
2 Not you, yourself, but what does the Board do?

3 A. Well, we meet occasionally and discuss the various
4 problems of the College, particularly in regard to public
5 relations and legislation. We don't attempt to interfere with
6 the day-to-day operation of the College. That isn't our ob-
7 ligation, but in the public relations and legislative matters,
8 we attempt to thoroughly go into those things and come up
9 with opinions and reasons for them.

10 Q. How often does your Board meet?

11 A. Well, it depends on what is going on. We can meet
12 frequently if there are matters to be discussed and handled
13 of importance, and if there aren't, and there isn't anything
14 on the agenda of consequence, why, we sometimes go for several
15 months without a meeting.

16 Q. During a school year, how many meetings would you
17 say you averaged?

18 A. Oh, I would say four. I am guessing; might be five,
19 might be three.

20 Q. Are the meetings held here at the College?

21 A. Usually on the campus.

22 Q. How many members are on the Board?

23 A. Twelve, I believe.

24 Q. Do most of them attend?

25 A. Excellent attendance; if they are in town, they
26 always come.

1 Q. And how long do the meetings last usually?

2 A. Oh, three to four hours.

3 Q. What time of day do you have the meetings?

4 A. We meet about 6:00 or 6:30.

5 Q. In the evening?

6 A. In the evening. We usually adjourn when the discus-
7 sing is over, 10:00 or 10:30, in that range.

8 Q. Does the Advisory Board have anything to say about
9 the administration of Fresno State College?

10 A. As I said in the first place, we don't attempt to
11 engage in affairs pertaining to administration. I think that
12 should be left to specialists who know more about the
13 problems. I did have six years school teaching experience;
14 it has helped me just a little.

15 Q. Was that in a public school?

16 A. Yes, that was a long time ago, 40 years. It gave
17 me a little background in education that I have always sort
18 of appreciated having.

19 Q. Do you think it would help if the local Advisory
20 Board, such as the one you are on, had some degree of author-
21 ity over the administration of the College?

22 A. Well, that is a difficult question to answer, and
23 the effectiveness of any board involving themselves with
24 administration would depend a lot on the individuals on that
25 board.

26 Q. Are the members of this Board given any compensation

1 for the work they do?

2 A. No, none.

3 Q. No expense money, either?

4 A. None.

5 Q. If the duties of this Board were expanded so that
6 you had some authority, and the result of it was to take your
7 time, say, four or five days a month, would you be able to
8 stay on the Board personally?

9 A. Yes, I would say I would.

10 Q. And how about the other members?

11 A. Well, I think it would vary with the other members,
12 but I would say there were many that would give that much
13 time.

14 Q. Do you think they would be willing to?

15 A. I couldn't speak for all of them, but my impression
16 is that a number of them would be willing to, and there may
17 be some that are out of town and so busy with their affairs
18 that they couldn't give that time, but there is sufficient
19 interest. If they could, I am sure they would.

20 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Hanna.

21 QUESTIONS BY ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA:

22 Q. Mr. Rodman, yesterday's testimony from the Board,
23 and, I think in particular from Mr. Blair, I got the impres-
24 sion that it was the philosophy in favor of the integration of
25 educational programs from kindergarten through college, con-
26 trolled and directed from one School Board. Do you subscribe

1 to such a philosophy?

2 A. I have given that matter a great deal of thought,
3 and I believe that that is true and could be true to some
4 advantage.

5 Q. If it were demonstrated to you that perhaps the
6 philosophy of education for the elementary school and second-
7 ary school was in conflict with, and to some degree unencom-
8 passible with the philosophy of education for higher grades
9 above secondary and, further than that, that the very impor-
10 tant relationships involved in education -- I am thinking
11 here of those relationships between student and teacher, and
12 student and subject matter and teacher and subject matter,
13 teacher and administration, and pupil and administration --
14 if it were demonstrated to you that all of these relationships
15 were very different to, in conflict with, and incompatible
16 with such relationships in the elementary school and in the
17 higher education, would this change your evaluation of this
18 first philosophy?

19 A. I would say that I am in a position, mentally, to
20 be flexible. I do think that something must be done for the
21 State College and whether it should come on the first proposal
22 or under this later proposal isn't, to me, a matter of such
23 great consequence that I can go along with either one. I
24 feel that there must be something done to improve this posi-
25 tion and give them more autonomy and better administration.

26 Q. Well, I thought that you made a very good point in

1 two directions here; one, that you thought the autonomy
2 should be increased. Let me ask you this: Is it conceivable
3 that we could have increased autonomy and a correction of
4 some of the weaknesses that Mr. Simpson brought out in rela-
5 tion to the Board of Education, and still not rule out the
6 possibility of a second Board for the State Colleges, who would
7 also have a Board set up that would correct the same
8 weaknesses?

9 A. I am not thoroughly familiar -- I haven't read the
10 original bill setting up the separate Board, and for that
11 reason there may be features in there that I am not thoroughly
12 familiar with. I am not in a position to give you the final
13 conclusion as to my opinion on that particular action or pro-
14 posal, but I feel so sincerely that something must be done,
15 and I think rather soon, that it occurred to me -- seemed to
16 me -- that the second proposal would, perhaps, be more accept-
17 able to get approval and get into action sooner than the
18 first proposal. It might be better in the long run because
19 of it's integration with the rest of the educational system.

20 Q. That is assuming the correctness of the original
21 philosophy of integration from the kindergarten to the
22 college?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. You spoke, secondly, of the need for responsibility,
25 or somebody to check with. Do you feel that there is a lack
26 of responsibility in the Board of Regents of the University at

1 the present time?

2 A. Well, I didn't want to bring that up, but I feel
3 that there is.

4 Q. Well, I thought that had to be implied in what you
5 are saying.

6 A. It has not the accountability to anyone that I
7 think is necessary for long-time balanced operation, and I
8 didn't want to see that sort of thing duplicated. I don't
9 think they have done so badly; I am not critical of them but
10 it looks, to me, like somebody in that deal missed something
11 in the accountability that is necessary.

12 I think that everybody needs a boss somewhere. You
13 fellows have one; the Public is yours.

14 Q. Well, did you hear the testimony of the second wit-
15 ness we had yesterday morning?

16 A. I am sorry, I was out of town yesterday and was not
17 here.

18 Q. Well, he suggested something about the legalizing
19 of the Liaison Committee, which would act as a rather super
20 structure above the separate Boards of higher education.
21 Wouldn't that sort of arrangement meet the requirements that
22 you have in mind?

23 A. Well, from what you have said briefly about it, it
24 could, if they had the authority to sit in a position of the
25 boss -- have the final say.

26 ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Thank you very much, Mr. Rodman.

1 I think that is all.

2 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Hegland.

3 QUESTIONS BY ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND:

4 Q. Mr. Rodman, who appoints you to this Committee?

5 A. Well, as I understand it, Dr. Joyal recommends and
6 the State Superintendent appoints.

7 Q. For what period of time are you appointed?

8 A. I think it is -- oh, four years.

9 Q. Does the press attend your meetings?

10 A. No.

11 Q. They do not?

12 A. Not as a rule. They could, but not as a rule.

13 Q. Are they open public meetings, publicized in
14 advance?

15 A. No.

16 Q. Has there appeared before your group in the last
17 year, any representative of any faculty group from Fresno
18 State College?

19 A. There have been other members of the faculty there.

20 Q. I mean as representatives of a faculty group within
21 the faculty?

22 A. No, not that I know of.

23 Q. Has your group, in the past year, referred a problem
24 which has been placed before you back to a faculty group for
25 their recommendation before you took action?

26 A. Yes, there is one matter that I recall in particular

1 that was quite an item of interest in the community, and it
2 was referred to a faculty group. I, and either one or two
3 other members of the Advisory Committee, sat with this
4 faculty group to consider the matter and reach a recommenda-
5 tion.

6 Q. Has your group, during the past year, after you had
7 reached a policy decision, sent a representative of your own
8 group to present the point of view of your Board itself be-
9 fore the State Board of Education?

10 A. I am just not sure that we have. We have written
11 many resolutions and letters supporting our position, but I
12 couldn't say definitely. I think in one or two cases there
13 were such contacts, but I wouldn't be sure about that.

14 Q. Have you personally attended a meeting of the State
15 Board of Education?

16 A. Never, never have.

17 Q. Has the State Board of Education, to your knowledge,
18 in the last two years referred a question to your Board for
19 your Board's recommendation?

20 A. Not that I know of. For a long time, a member of
21 our Board was a member of the State Board, and we had rather
22 close contact through Judge Gilbert, and now we have a new
23 member of our Board who is also on the State Board.

24 Q. Do you have an Alumni Association at Fresno State
25 College?

26 A. Yes, we have.

1 Q. Is the Alumni Association officially represented at
2 the meetings of your group?

3 A. Well, I wouldn't know whether you would call it
4 "officially" or not. There are several very active members
5 of the alumni that are members of our Committee, and they are
6 very outspoken.

7 Q. I think the question pertains to people who are not
8 members of your Committee. Does anyone attend your Committee
9 meetings regularly representing the Alumni Association?

10 A. I think the answer to that would be no. I am sure
11 it is not regularly.

12 Q. Well, has it happened in the last year that there was
13 an official representative of the Alumni Association?

14 A. In regards to a matter where they appointed a
15 special committee of the staff to go into the matter with
16 some of the members of our Board.

17 Q. Now, my last question is: We had quite a hassle
18 about engineering in State colleges. Did your Board take
19 any action on whether or not Fresno State College should seek
20 accreditation for it's engineering courses, or whether or not
21 your college should offer the Master's Degree for Engineering?

22 A. It was discussed many times, and we were very
23 definite in our opinions that it should be permitted.

24 ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: Thank you very much.

25 CHAIRMAN SEGWICK: Any other questions?

26 (No response.)

1 If not, thank you very much, Mr. Rodman.

2 Now, I think the next witness that I will call on will
3 be Mr. Clinton Jordan, Administrative Analyst from the State
4 Legislative Budget Committee.

5 ---oOo---

6 CLINTON JORDAN,

7 appeared as a witness before the Sub-Committee, and testified
8 as follows, to wit:

9 MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee,
10 I am Clinton Jordan with the Legislative Budget Committee, and
11 I have been asked to appear today to discuss this subject.

12 I think it might be beneficial if we back up a little
13 bit and review, perhaps, oversimplify some of the basic ques-
14 tions that have come out in the discussion yesterday, as to
15 just what the relationship of the Legislative Branch and the
16 Executive Branch is.

17 Again I say, at the expense of over-simplifying the whole
18 question, the determination of policy is obviously a Legisla-
19 tive function and the execution of policy is, obviously, an
20 Executive function. The statement was made in a number of
21 cases yesterday that the segments of the Executive Branch
22 were blocking the program of State Colleges through the addi-
23 tional control.

24 I don't think that there is a single agency in the State
25 Government that wouldn't say that if they were given more
26 money and less control from various segments of the Executive

1 Branch that they could do a bigger and better job. I don't
2 think that the situation is peculiar to education or to higher
3 education, and, as far as responsibility of the funds, respon-
4 sibility to the people, which most of them touched on at one
5 phase or another in yesterday's discussion, certainly there is
6 no one closer to the people than the Legislature.

7 In situations where the funds are getting low, we know
8 that there is the responsibility there, it is the Legislature
9 that has to go back and be accountable directly to the people
10 for these funds. It is a very real competition between
11 agencies for this money, and it evolves back to Legislative
12 decision.

13 We have the Legislature, then, determining this policy
14 and appropriating the funds; we have the Executive Branch
15 executing the policy and exercising what controls are neces-
16 sary to direct this policy.

17 In addition, then, we have various boards set up who have
18 special jurisdiction. In this case, education and determina-
19 tion of policy, and it is primarily long in educative back-
20 ground, curriculum, and things that have to do directly with
21 education.

22 Over the years, I think that perhaps that differentiation
23 has become somewhat less clear. There are probably things
24 that the Board hasn't done in the past that have been assumed
25 by the Legislature.

26 I think some of this discussion of what curriculum should

1 be in secondary education and in primary education, perhaps,
2 is a function that the Legislature has taken away from the
3 Board because they haven't felt that a job is being done
4 there. Some of the textbook deals fall in the same category,
5 but, when it comes to policy determination and appropriation
6 of funds, why, the Legislature is supreme in that area, and
7 I don't think that it can be questioned.

8 The Legislature needs, in addition to this information
9 that it gets through the Executive Branch, it needs an
10 accountability of funds; it needs a budget review; it needs
11 to look into the faculty staffing formulas and student
12 faculty ratios and all these other operating statistics in
13 order to make a judgment as to where the money is going to go.
14 It, in turn, needs these controls that the Executive Branch
15 offers to them in order to ably analyze the whole situa-
16 tion.

17 I think one of our main considerations in this, other
18 than this basic oversimplifyied approach to it, is the differ-
19 entiation of function which we have always felt very strongly.
20 Again, the basis behind it is to get the most for the educa-
21 tional dollar. We have supported that phase of the restudy
22 consistently. Not that there should be a definite line between
23 each of the segments that can't be bridged, there has to be
24 some flexibility there and you have to recognize that there
25 are individual needs of communities that have to be --
26 that have to cause some overlapping rightfully there, but,

1 basically, there should be a differentiation of function all
2 the way through, and that is one of the things that this
3 proposal will actually work in the opposite direction.

4 As far as the creation, then, of either a second Board
5 or a very strong Board which will have some of the controls
6 of the Executive Branch and some of the controls of the Legis-
7 lature, we are definitely opposed to that phase of it. As
8 far as the establishment of two separate Boards, there is a
9 lot to be said for that.

10 I am not authorized to speak for it or against it at this
11 point, because I don't think all the facts are in on the sub-
12 ject. I think that there are a lot of questions, however,
13 that should be asked and some of the questions apply directly
14 to this strong board; also apply to whether we have two Boards
15 or not.

16 I think, perhaps, the better approach would be just what
17 isn't being done now by the Board. Maybe we should go back
18 to that point touched on by Mr. Hanna yesterday and have an
19 inventory as to just what the Board should do.

20 I have had the privilege of sitting in on a couple of
21 Board meetings this year, and I say very definitely that we
22 have a very conscientious Board, a very able Board, and I think
23 that they are doing a good job. However, this subject of just
24 what they are to handle, which hasn't been touched on very
25 much, is really the issue. This Board meets with an agenda
26 of 50, 60, 70 items and an agenda which they receive before-

1 hand of, well, it is at least six inches thick. So they
2 plow through this and they do a good job but the physical
3 impossibility of going through and adequately giving proper
4 time to the policy questions is the thing that I think we
5 should recognize here.

6 Just how much of it is Administrative?

7 Now, certain members of the Board, I think, recognize
8 this fact themselves. There has been discussion of that
9 briefly at some of the Board meetings. The answer has been,
10 of course, that most of this is mandatory. It is written in
11 the Code. Is that necessarily the reason we have to live with
12 it?

13 There are a great deal of administrative matters, at
14 least it would seem to me, or matters that could be administra-
15 tive matters of receiving reports and appointments and
16 approvals, confirmations and all that type of thing. Quite a
17 bit of time is spent on credentials and on revocation of cre-
18 dentials, and sort of a quasi appeal job there.

19 I don't say this in criticism of the Board and its
20 actions because we have, as I say, in my opinion, a very con-
21 scientious Board and one that is doing a good job, but someone
22 should take a closer look, first, at what is being done.
23 In other words, when the job gets physically too big, you can
24 either divide the work up and make sure that you are doing the
25 proper amount and delegate the execution of this work but still
26 hold on the policy phase of it, or, you can split it up.

1 When you split it up, you have the problem which has
2 come up in several ways yesterday and today, how to coordinate
3 this. I don't think that necessarily a case can be made from
4 sheer volume of work any more than any other phase of govern-
5 ment.

6 When it becomes so thick, delegation is the answer, but
7 not release of policy, any more than the Legislature wants to
8 release it's control of appropriations and it's delegation of
9 policy matters, so the proper function of the Board, I think,
10 can be looked at.

11 Now, perhaps some of the answer might be additional
12 staff. I don't know. I am not recommending this at this
13 point but I would certainly, rather than start dividing, con-
14 sider that as to what should be covered and the best way to
15 cover it.

16 Then, this whole matter of cooperation of the various
17 levels in education. If we have a stronger Board, as created,
18 again, by the separate proposal rather than two Boards, we
19 have the problem of coordinating again. We have a strong
20 Board of Regents, a strong State Board, so we have the problem
21 of either a master Liaison Committee with more teeth in it,
22 as has been suggested, and perhaps that is a good answer to
23 it, or we can move in the other direction and say, "Let's have
24 a Policy Board that covers the entire realm of higher educa-
25 tion and lower education".

26 Again, I can't, at this point, as I say, until all the

1 facts are in on it, make a recommendation. When we talk
2 about integration of education, as Mr. Hanna was speaking of,
3 and Mr. Daba spoke of yesterday, I think we have a real point
4 there. In that regard, I think a quotation from the same
5 book that Dr. Glenny spoke from yesterday is in order here,
6 and in their final chapter, if I may just very briefly read
7 it, it does point up very well, I think, with your indulgence
8 I would like to read this: "During the twentieth century,
9 some states have reduced the number of boards dealing directly
10 with the Legislature by creating separate systems of State-
11 operated institutions. The States have established a board
12 with jurisdiction over the State educational institutions
13 under the State Board of Education. In effect, this plan has
14 consolidated a State Program of Education and the two major
15 boards, the State Board of Education and the State Education
16 Board for State educational institutions not under the State
17 Board of Education".

18 Then, in conclusion, it says: "This movement to major
19 education agencies may well be an intermediate stage of the
20 further development of the State structure of State education.
21 As State education institutions come to be headed by regulatory
22 boards and increase in scope and complexity, legislation may
23 find it desirable to establish a single education authority."

24 So, my question is: At that stage in the development
25 of California, are we already ahead of many other States?
26 In other words, this coordination, consolidation of higher

1 education in other States, we are already at the point where
2 we have two boards; is not the next step, then, perhaps the
3 consideration of one Board, full integration?

4 Again, I just throw this out. I can't make this recom-
5 mendation and I think some of the facts that we would like to
6 have in weighing this whole problem are not available.

7 A final consideration that I have is that perhaps one
8 of the most important considerations should be for fully
9 adequate central administrative control of the State colleges
10 within the Executive Branch, not on the Board level now, but
11 as representatives within the State college system that can
12 present a program which has been erected by the Board, what-
13 ever Board it is, to the Legislature instead of piecemeal
14 autonomy, if you want to call it that.

15 If they don't get their points across, why, individual
16 presidents have felt that the best way is to present their
17 case before the Legislature. Now, whoever presents the best
18 case is the one that can get the most from it. Is that the
19 right approach here? We have been talking about competition
20 between the University in Sacramento and various State colleges.

21 We also have the competition between the State colleges,
22 actually in addition to competition for the educational dollar
23 and backing up to my first statement about the competition for
24 the whole dollar.

25 So, that is a real need, in my opinion, to the situation
26 of various presidents appearing before committees as actually

1 unique among the agencies. In most cases, all your other
2 departments of Mental Hygiene Correction, a united front is
3 placed before the committees and the budget is considered as
4 a unit, which is what starts out to be the case as far as the
5 State colleges are concerned. Then it develops, in many
6 cases, that it is an individual presentation. As I say, only
7 to the invitation of various other divisions within an agency
8 is there anything similar to this type of presentation.

9 It is the administration standards that make for coordi-
10 nation. They are all directly a result of that fact, so I
11 think that, then, is the third main area that should be con-
12 sidered at this time.

13 As far as what other States are doing, it is of interest,
14 but I don't think it necessarily proves anything but with re-
15 gard to the presentation of budgets directly to the Legisla-
16 ture or through control agencies.

17 The Council of State Governments recently completed a
18 study as to the disposition of the budgets of the various
19 boards. This survey took in 162 boards in 43 States and
20 covered the work of 327 institutions. Of the 162 boards,
21 three boards presented their budgets directly to the Legisla-
22 ture for approval. Those were the States of Arkansas, Illi-
23 nois and Washington. Nineteen boards presented them to a
24 central agency under the Executive Branch, but they are not
25 revised, they are merely looked at and passed on to the
26 Legislature.

1 The balance are 140 boards; 80 percent of the sample
2 taken. The budgets of the various institutions that are under
3 the control of the Board are subject to revision by a central
4 control agency.

5 Well, that is my presentation of what I consider to be
6 the pertinent facts here. If I can answer any questions, I
7 would be happy to.

8 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: I believe you have a question, Mr.
9 Doyle.

10 QUESTIONS BY ASSEMBLYMAN DOYLE:

11 Q. Mr. Jordan, you were talking about the possibility
12 of introgration, rather than the establishment of a new
13 board. Would the philosophy there entail kindergarten through
14 all of higher education, including the University of Califor-
15 nia -- that would be the abandonment of the Regents -- and
16 all education would be under one board?

17 A. I am saying that that should be considered.

18 Q. I know you didn't recommend it but I wanted to be
19 sure that your philosophy of integration also covered the
20 University of California. Secondly, I wonder if this informa-
21 tion, some of this factual data that you have quoted from
22 there, might be made available to the Committee?

23 A. Yes, I will have it duplicated, or, there is the 1955
24 publication of the United States Department of Health, Educa-
25 tion and Welfare in State Education, the survey that Dr.
26 Glenny mentioned, and summarizes the whole thing, and then

1 each State is made out.

2 ASSEMBLYMAN DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, would it be out of
3 order to suggest that possibly a copy of that could be made
4 available to the members of the Committee?

5 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: I think that each member should have
6 a copy of that.

7 MR. JORDAN: Would you like me to make that arrangement
8 and see to that?

9 ASSEMBLYMAN DOYLE: Could you see that each of us could
10 get a copy of that?

11 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Jordan, will you make those
12 available?

13 MR. JORDAN: Yes.

14 ASSEMBLYMAN DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, may it be suggested
15 that if any factual data comes through that Mr. Jordan feels
16 would be of interest to the Committee, could he be authorized
17 to pass it on, at least to you, to see if you feel it should
18 be disbursed to us?

19 I think that we sometimes need this information, not only
20 for our own use but for background for speeches. Some of the
21 various data of what is going on in other areas, I think, is
22 sometimes awfully hard to latch on to.

23 Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Anderson.

25 QUESTIONS BY ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON:

26 Q. I would like to ask a question about this accounta-

1 bility factor. You previously suggested that the separate
2 Board's autonomy lacks accountability. Would you comment on
3 that please?

4 A. A separate Board with autonomy lacks responsibility?

5 Q. Including the present Board of Regents for the
6 University of California.

7 A. Well, as far as the Board of Regents is concerned,
8 I don't think there is any question. Part of it goes back
9 historically. It was set up that way with direct ties from
10 the Constitution and through the years, it has been considered
11 as an entirely separate group. For that reason, perhaps, there
12 haven't been as many direct controls from either the Executive
13 Branch or the Legislative Branch.

14 Actually, we would like to see more controls move in
15 that direction. There is great cooperation now between the
16 University and the Department of Finance and the other control
17 agencies.

18 I haven't mentioned any of the control agencies. I just
19 lumped them altogether, but just because that has been the
20 situation in the past doesn't mean that it is correct as far
21 as it is concerned. There has been cooperation. They have
22 done a fine job and they may say the reason for that is be-
23 cause there isn't the control.

24 In fact, I am sure they do say that, which is one of the
25 positions that the State colleges are somewhat envious of.

26 Q. Are you suggesting that A.B. 882 might establish a

1 separate Board with sufficient autonomy to also lack this
2 accountability factor?

3 A. No, no, because nothing of the controls would be
4 taken off there. I don't think that that is a simple case at
5 all. I have been speaking more of the autonomy because of the
6 lack of the Executive controls, which apply more to the pro-
7 posal of the Department, rather than the two separate Boards.

8 If we don't have those controls taken off, we don't lose
9 the autonomy. The problem is actually the coordination of the
10 responsibilities. In either case you have one, two or three
11 separate Boards, strong Boards; then you have the problem of
12 coordination.

13 Maybe that is all right. Above that, you have the
14 Master Committee, whatever you want to call it, coordinating
15 that, but the more break-down you have and then trying to
16 centralize it again, the more of a coordinating problem you
17 have, because each one of the segments meets separately and
18 they consider that their function is of supreme importance.
19 They should, because that is their job and they would be dere-
20 lict if they didn't look at it that way.

21 All of this talk of State colleges being a step-child
22 stems from that. I can't, of course, go along with that at
23 all because I certainly think that the whole education that
24 is given in the State college is very fine. It's teachers
25 and the whole set-up is definitely not second grade, and if
26 you look at the whole set-up of any of the State colleges, and

1 compare it with some private colleges, I think you will find
2 that it is very fine.

3 Q. In reference to time spent on State college matters,
4 now, by these State Boards, would you consider it to be
5 sufficient?

6 A. Well, they spend, in my opinion, over 50 percent of
7 their time in the Board meetings that I have been at, and, as
8 I say, they have a tremendous volume of material.

9 I would say that 50 percent of the time, talking in
10 terms of percent, other than volume work, is fine. My con-
11 sideration is that perhaps too much time is spent in adminis-
12 trative details, material that could be prepared beforehand
13 to get to the issue.

14 Again, I don't mean a criticism of the State Board actions,
15 but I have attended some of their meetings. One issue in
16 particular that we have criticized and we wanted to hear what
17 the Board was going to do about it, so they discussed it.
18 They presented a very fine report, very complete, that was
19 really preparatory material; in fact, it was presented and
20 said, "This is the situation. We want direction. Is this
21 satisfactory? Are we going in the right direction?"

22 The report was received and discussed and it was a fine
23 report, and so forth, but it just lacked that putting it into
24 effect and saying, "Yes, this is the right way to go and that
25 is the wrong way." I think, again, as an observer, not in
26 direct criticism, that that is the type of thing that should

1 be discussed with the Board, and many of the members are aware
2 of the situation.

3 Q. Well, if their administrative activity were deleted
4 and there were more policy-making activities acted upon by
5 the Board, would six times a year be sufficient for all of the
6 elementary, secondary and higher education matters?

7 A. Well, I think it is on the shy side, actually. I
8 think that perhaps a monthly meeting, as the Regents have,
9 would be more in order. Also, again, I think that can be
10 determined by an analysis of what is accomplished at various
11 Board meetings.

12 ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions?

14 Mr. Collier.

15 QUESTIONS BY ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER:

16 Q. Relative to this financial control, I think there is
17 -- and I make this statement and I wish you would comment
18 upon it -- that the University of California does not submit
19 a line item budget and they are not under control. Now, that
20 is misleading because isn't it a fact that the University of
21 California does submit a line item budget, and we pass upon
22 that budget and the Legislative Analyst analyzes that budget
23 and makes recommendations for augmentations or deletions, so
24 it is under control. Once we appropriate that money, we have
25 lost control of it, but, indirectly, the subsequent years, we
26 do have control.

1 Say, we appropriated \$75,000,000 last year. Now, we
2 still control the purse strings and can enforce them to use
3 endowments. We have done that in the past.

4 Now, is that a correct statement?

5 A. There is definitely control on a cooperative basis,
6 but the Department of Finance was successful in reducing
7 that budget by some \$2,000,000 last year. However, after it
8 is, as you say, submitted in lump sum, then some of it gets
9 into different funds.

10 There is a definite line item budget to begin with.

11 Q. Well, that is the point I wanted to bring out because
12 that must be a misconception by some people in the Department
13 that feel that the University does not have any control.

14 Then, the controllable items are submitted in a line
15 item budget and acted upon by the Legislature, and a subse-
16 quent Legislature is still in control, they still hold the
17 purse strings to the extent of around \$75,000 of the Univer-
18 sity of California?

19 A. That is right.

20 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Doyle, do you have any questions?

21 QUESTIONS BY ASSEMBLYMAN DOYLE:

22 Q. Mr. Jordan, you are primarily interested in expendi-
23 tures of funds for all phases of government, are you not?
24 That is the job of your department?

25 A. That is right.

26 Q. And whether it is education, agriculture, mental

1 health, you are always there, explaining the position of your
2 office as an analyst, as to what this money can buy -- what
3 this dollar can buy.

4 Now, you mentioned awhile ago that, under the present
5 system, as I took your testimony, that perhaps it is the
6 squeaky wheel -- it is those there firstest with the mostest
7 that get the action or get the money; is that correct?

8 A. The one that presents the best case.

9 Q. So then we get into the realm of politics, shall we
10 say, or sub-relations for the one that is more aggressive
11 than the other?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Now, do you feel that that would still happen under
14 the presentation made by Dr. Simpson through the College
15 Presidents? Do you feel that that condition would still
16 exist?

17 A. I think it would exist in even greater degree because
18 a single Board with greater control would be more subject to
19 pressures, both from individual presidents and from individual
20 constituents, than would the whole Legislature.

21 The Legislature is subject to pressures of individual
22 constituents of different parties, and that is part of govern-
23 ment, but, it is a large body and there are competing influen-
24 ces and it can look at the whole picture.

25 That was one of the points that I wanted to get across.
26 If we split and give this particular group autonomy over here,

1 not particularly Education, but any group, you give them the
2 purse strings. Those individual pressures can exert much
3 more influence on this group than the broad Legislature. Cer-
4 tain members are subject to more types of pressures than
5 others, but it balances itself out.

6 They represent the people and the will of the people
7 holds, of course. I think that is a good point.

8 Q. Well, that answers my question.

9 Several people have brought up the University of Califor-
10 nia versus State Colleges. You say that you have received
11 full cooperation between the University of California and
12 your department and, I assume, that is also true of the
13 Ways and Means Committee and the Department of Finance?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Do you feel -- Mr. Collier brought up this control
16 business, which he feels, and certainly I think the Legisla-
17 ture feels they have some control over the University. Do
18 you feel that the Legislature, the Legislative Analyst, the
19 Department of Finance, would have that same control and the
20 same cooperation with the Department of Education if this
21 type of a proposal was initiated and put into law?

22 A. Well, I certainly can't say that the Department will
23 not cooperate with this if this comes to pass. However,
24 with more freedom, more relaxed controls, the ability to get
25 that relies more upon cooperation than it does the ability to
26 go in and look at things. You become thinner in your control

1 so that I would say even if it is full cooperation, it still
2 relies upon cooperation.

3 Q. In other words, even if they are willing to cooperate,
4 this would allow them not to cooperate as much as you might
5 like to have them do.

6 A. In other words, if you go to the extreme in this,
7 you could say that every agency is on the honor system.
8 Isn't that a matter of cooperation to it's fullest? That,
9 obviously, isn't the answer to rely wholly on cooperation.
10 That is why there are these control agencies, so that we give
11 them responsibility, accountability for a job well done or
12 not well done.

13 Then we have an audit of some sort to make sure that
14 that is right. They are given a job to be done and the area
15 in which to work and they are held accountable for that work.

16 Cooperation is fine, but personally -- and I am sure
17 the attitude of our Department is that it should be a manda-
18 tory proposition rather than just full cooperation.

19 Q. Well, forgetting for the moment, and not taking
20 into consideration the present Education Administration,
21 once you freeze this thing to the Constitution, that is the
22 answer. I mean there isn't anything you can do about it,
23 is there?

24 A. That is right, that is right, and that is particu-
25 larly why I wanted to read that passage from this book here
26 as to whether or not we are stepping in the right direction,

1 because it is easier to put things in the Constitution than
2 it is to get them out.

3 ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Mr. Chairman, I would like to,
4 rather than directing a question -- or perhaps it is a request
5 with a question mark at the end of it.

6 Since, as I understand it, this witness represents the
7 Legislative Analyst Office or Administrative Analyst Office,
8 is it possible that we could have Mr. Jordan, or some member
9 in that staff, make a study and make it available to this
10 Committee revolving around the following questions:

11 What are we getting for our budget dollar in the way
12 of personnel results in the University set-up, as contrasted
13 to the personnel results in the Board of Education, as to
14 results relating directly to the State Colleges?

15 In the same question as to these other matters that Mr.
16 Blair and Mr. Simpson testified to, I think one was purchas-
17 ing and one was financial control.

18 Now, I think this Committee should know what result is the
19 State's money getting under the system utilized under the
20 Board of Regents, and what results are we getting by the sys-
21 tem and procedures being used by the Board of Education?

22 If you think there are other significant phases that
23 should be contrasted and the results of that, would you please
24 do that?

25 MR. JORDAN: Well, actually, of course, we attempt to do
26 much of that type of thing in our analysis, which we prepare

1 each year. I started out about this time last year and I
2 was new to this phase of the job, as far as Education was
3 concerned.

4 Prior to that, I have been in fiscal agencies, but, at
5 that time, I wanted to make direct comparisons wherever pos-
6 sible of the State Universities with the State Colleges, not
7 only with the staff formulas and all the rest of the things
8 that should be comparable, including salaries and time spent
9 and faculty staffing ratios, and so forth, all maintenance
10 type of figures.

11 It was difficult at that time to make direct comparisons
12 because of different methods of accounting and so forth. We
13 had to make qualifications and that type of thing so we have
14 individual analyses of the new systems, but when it comes to
15 comparisons, why, we ran into a lot of jags.

16 I think we will have some of those ironed out this time,
17 not fully, but there are a lot of complications just in the
18 matter of collecting data, when a University is compared with
19 the State Colleges.

20 Perhaps, off-hand, this doesn't sound like a big job,
21 but it really is because the method of collection is difficult.
22 We really want to do that, where possible, and where we can,
23 we make those comparisons and if their qualifications or
24 assumptions have been made, well, we try to state them.

25 For that reason, we try to tell how much it costs to
26 educate someone in State Colleges, as compared to the Univer-

1 sity. That alone doesn't mean anything because the Univer-
2 sity, with it's research and so on, runs the cost up. The
3 figures themselves don't mean anything. It is what goes into
4 them, but it does bring out what we are looking for.

5 ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Well, that is what I am thinking; I
6 am thinking we shouldn't get into a situation where we are
7 trying to compare the procedures and results of one type of
8 higher education against the others. It is like comparing
9 eggs and peaches. I mean, it ought to be that it could be
10 such a classification that we could compare it and make some
11 type of analysis and if we can't do it, it is wrong and we
12 are working in the dark. I think there should be some light.

13 Mr. Chairman, if you or the Committee do not agree, I
14 would be willing to go along with you, but I think this is
15 an area that needs exploring.

16 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Do you think, Mr. Jordan, that you
17 could make such a report to this Committee?

18 MR. JORDAN: At what time?

19 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: If I was to set the time, I would
20 say next week, but we will give you a little longer.

21 MR. JORDAN: We will do our best, and certainly we
22 will gather that material and see that the members of the
23 Committee all receive that.

24 ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we ought to
25 write a letter from the Chair to both the University and the
26 Board of Education, asking that they give their full coopera-

1 tion on this to help them expedite it.

2 ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: Mr. Chairman, I think that I can
3 point out one place right now that would be beneficial to
4 the Analyst and that is this:

5 Isn't it true that in your State Colleges for your
6 lower division work --- if you will measure a man's ability
7 upon his academic standing and his years of experience teach-
8 ing -- that in your State Colleges in your lower division
9 work, you are having professors or assistant professors who
10 are doing the job, whereas in the University, in the lower
11 division work, that responsibility is delegated, maybe, to
12 students?

13 If that is true, that is certainly a measure as to
14 whether we are getting the value for the dollar.

15 ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: I think, too, there can be a compari-
16 son made on the administrative level as to the type of people
17 who are administrating certain functions in the higher echelons
18 in the University set-up, as against the qualification require-
19 ments and so on and salaries of people who are doing the like
20 on the administrative levels and higher echelons in the Board
21 of Education.

22 ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: Mr. Chairman, on that point, I
23 would like to see added to this comparison of the require-
24 ments at the top echelon of University administration in com-
25 parison with the requirements in the top echelon of the
26 State College administration in reference to the degrees held

1 and the specific occupational background from which these
2 people come.

3 For example, I would like to know whether more people
4 come from education, per se, in the State Colleges and in the
5 Department of Education, than the University has found de-
6 sirable to employ to the top echelon in the administrative
7 positions in the University.

8 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Jordan, would it be helpful to
9 you if you had a letter from our Committee here, requesting
10 this report?

11 MR. JORDAN: Oh, I don't think that will be necessary,
12 actually. We have gotten full cooperation with all concerned
13 in it, so that I appreciate that, but I don't think that it
14 is really necessary.

15 ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONOHUE: I would like to have something
16 else analyzed while we are analyzing. Nevertheless, if we
17 are going to talk on the overall picture of higher education
18 and raising our standards, I don't want us to lose sight of
19 our responsibility to the Junior College as an integral part
20 of the system of higher education.

21 I would like to have analyzed, from your neutral, objec-
22 tive background, the feasibility of establishing a Junior
23 College Board so that we can promulgate the philosophy that
24 Junior Colleges are part of higher education, rather than
25 secondary education.

26 Should we consider Junior Colleges in a separate

1 category? Now, everyone shelves them down with a secondary
2 level, and let's face it, a lot of our high school adminis-
3 trators, especially in high school districts, are reluctant
4 to give the autonomy to the Junior College because if they
5 establish a Junior College Board, the high school isn't going
6 to be able to use, it wants to use, that is, labeled Junior
7 College.

8 Now, if they are really going to be positive about this
9 in long range planning, I would like to know about where the
10 college is going to be placed. For example, if you are going
11 to have two Boards, then, the Junior College can be consider-
12 ed a part of the State College Board?

13 Now, I realize the difference there between State funds
14 and local funds. We would still have a local College Board
15 paid for from State local taxes of the State, but, neverthe-
16 less, if the State Colleges are a step-child, the Junior
17 Colleges are that much farther down.

18 Now, we have real evidence that Junior College transfers
19 get a few points higher grade ratio at the end of their first
20 year than the freshmen who enter the University of California.
21 We certainly have evidence that the Junior College system is
22 a system of higher education, and yet, I think, to most people
23 they are considered as part of an extended high school
24 program.

25 With the high school, we then have the Junior College
26 and the State University, and so, I would like to get a delinea-

1 tion as to where high school and Junior College stop and
2 where University education picks up, especially as much as
3 California is leading the Nation in it's Junior College pro-
4 gram.

5 I think that Idaho has one or two Junior Colleges; Oregon
6 has almost none; some of them are afraid to start Junior
7 Colleges because they say it is the first step towards a
8 State College and they don't want to build on that program.

9 I know many States are sending people into California,
10 observing our Junior College program, and when you go back
11 to the Western States Conference or back to the President's
12 White House Conference, everyone is appalled with amazement
13 at the growth of the Junior Colleges and their services.

14 They have kind of grown up, like Topsy, with us and I
15 think before they get larger, we should have our own markings
16 pretty clear because people are coming to California, looking
17 to us as an example as to what to do. I don't think we have
18 really given them an objective look.

19 MR. JORDAN: Actually, all these subjects that you have
20 mentioned here are all very important. It almost begins
21 to look like an assignment for the Joint Assembly in Ways
22 and Means Committee on Education, which has it's first meet-
23 ing tomorrow.

24 ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONOHUE: Are you going to be there?

25 MR. JORDAN: No, I won't be at that meeting but I will
26 probably attend a subsequent meeting. I am not sure what is

1 happening at this point. We haven't been contacted, but it
2 sounds like all these questions that have been asked are
3 very appropriate.

4 ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONOHUE: I think we are going to have it
5 in writing because you get a little annoyed at high school
6 teachers who feel they are superior to grammar school
7 teachers.

8 Also, college teachers who feel superior to junior
9 college teachers; I mean, within our own family we have
10 jealousies that have to be removed, and I think in order to
11 remove that, we have to have a real line of demarkation.

12 You can't legislate jealousy but you can sure try.

13 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Allen.

14 QUESTIONS BY ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN:

15 Q. About this budgeting, Mr. Jordan, I noticed some
16 buildings going up here on the campus. If those buildings
17 cost Fresno State College less than we appropriated for the
18 building, what happens to the excess? Is the college free
19 to spend it in air conditioning in other buildings?

20 A. No, that reverts.

21 Q. The college doesn't keep that money?

22 A. No.

23 Q. Now, in the case of the University, if the building
24 costs less than the University appropriated for the building,
25 does that revert also?

26 A. As far as the cost of the building, it does not

1 revert immediately. However, in this last budget, why, some
2 of that money that was in excess of the amount used was revert-
3 ed through the Department of Finance.

4 MR. WHITSELL: May I help answer this question? If
5 the building at the University costs less than the money
6 appropriated, it is retained by the University. If the build-
7 ing comes in that costs more than the money appropriated, they
8 must first account for all money that they have saved on pre-
9 vious buildings before they can participate in any augmenta-
10 tion from the State.

11 ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Account for it? So they aren't sav-
12 ing it in a pot somewhere?

13 MR. WHITSELL: That is right.

14 Q. Suppose they spent it on other buildings that
15 weren't approved by the Legislature?

16 A. Well, they do file claims with the Controller on
17 the capital outlay appropriations and thus account for that
18 money.

19 Q. Is the University free to take the savings of one
20 building and spend it on another building the Legislature
21 never considered?

22 A. Almost their entire program is from State appropria-
23 tions for capital outlay. The money from State appropriations
24 is not spent on buildings that are financed from endowment
25 funds.

26 Q. That is not my question. If there is \$5,000,000 voted

1 for the Berkeley campus and it costs \$3,500,000, isn't the
2 University free to spend the rest of the money?

3 A. But they must account for it at the time they spend
4 the additional funds.

5 Q. But they can spend it?

6 A. It is considered University money.

7 Q. In fact, they can spend it on a different campus?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Now, I have another question. There are some dormi-
10 tories here on campus. How many feet per student are provid-
11 ed in each group?

12 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Can I interrupt here just a moment?
13 I think Mr. Whitsell was next on the agenda here. Maybe
14 Mr. Jordan has finished.

15 ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Maybe Mr. Jordan could answer this?

16 MR. JORDAN: I think actually those questions -- if
17 Mr. Whitsell cares to answer those, he can probably give you
18 a more exact answer.

19 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: If there are no more questions for
20 Mr. Jordan, we want to thank you for being here.

21 Now, Mr. Whitsell, you are next on the program.

22 ---oOo---

23 JAMES WHITSELL,

24 appeared as a witness before the Sub-Committee and testified
25 as follows, to wit:

26 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Allen, would you like to continue

1 your questioning?

2 ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Thank you.

3 QUESTIONS BY ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN:

4 Q. Mr. Whitsell, do you recall how many square feet
5 per student are provided in the State College dormitories?

6 A. I don't recall off hand. I think I know what the
7 point of your question is, Mr. Allen. The fact that the
8 University has a larger space per student in their dormitories
9 than the State Colleges are allowed.

10 Q. Yes.

11 A. At the time the dormitory program was authorized
12 and under consideration, the program was that -- well,
13 let me back up just a bit. The program in the University and
14 the State Colleges are somewhat different in that the Univer-
15 sity contains in their dormitories a dining hall and kitchen
16 which is not included in the State College Residence Hall
17 Program.

18 Q. I mean, in the single room the student occupies,
19 are the rooms the same size in the State College dormitories
20 as the University?

21 A. The rooms in the University Dormitory Program vary
22 from campus to campus. The University has allowed them, I
23 believe it is, 235 square feet per student in the entire
24 dormitory. The local campus can choose, then, either to put
25 it in recreation rooms, in student rooms, student lounges,
26 dining rooms or their kitchen, whereas in the dormitory pro-

1 gram for the State College, they are built on identical
2 plans or modified to fit the geographical situation, but each
3 room is of the same size in the State College Program.

4 Q. How many square feet?

5 A. I believe that it is about 150 square feet in the
6 room itself and the overall program would be approximately
7 190 in the entire program, or, a little less than 200 feet.

8 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Hegland.

9 QUESTIONS BY ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND:

10 Q. This comparison, then, is 235?

11 A. I couldn't tell you what the University has in the
12 individual student room because it does vary from campus to
13 campus. The 235 includes the dining room and the kitchen at
14 the University. I believe the difference, if you excluded
15 the dining room and the kitchen from the University, the
16 University would have approximately 12 square feet more in
17 their dormitories than the State Colleges have.

18 ASSEMBLYMAN ALLEN: Why is there a difference in the
19 size of the rooms between the State College dormitory and
20 the University dormitory?

21 A. Well, the University Program has been left on the
22 basis that this cost per student, to house a student, would
23 be on the basis of \$4,000 per student and that is approxi-
24 mately the cost of the State College Program.

25 It was on the basis of money rather than the square
26 foot.

1 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Now, did you have a comment you want-
2 ed to make?

3 MR. WHITSELL: No, we don't have any prepared or official
4 statement, Mr. Chairman. We are here merely to help, if we
5 could, on questions that did arise.

6 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Hanna.

7 QUESTIONS BY ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA:

8 Q. You are representing the Department of Finance?

9 A. I work in the Department of Finance, yes, sir.

10 Q. Do you feel we could eliminate the pre-audit in the
11 State Colleges without running into serious fiscal difficulties?

12 A. We have felt, up to the present time, Mr. Hanna,
13 that we could not. We have, in certain circumstances, limited
14 a great deal; for example, on the equipment list for the
15 State Colleges, once it is reviewed and the items have been
16 approved and included as part of the money in equipment items
17 for the budget, if there are no questions on those particular
18 items, they are never re-audited again. They are sent directly
19 to the Division of Purchases.

20 Now, in case there is some unusual type of equipment or
21 something that has been in the previous year, a type that has
22 been requested by the Legislature to look at particularly
23 carefully, we do submit it to the Department of Finance for
24 checking again before it is transported to the Division of
25 Purchases, and we felt that we could not do away completely
26 with the pre-audit on that type of thing.

1 Q. Have you read the proposal that was given to the
2 Committee yesterday?

3 A. We have read it very briefly, Mr. Hanna.

4 Q. Has your department had a chance to analyze it?

5 A. Not completely but basically we would recommend
6 against the proposal.

7 Q. Would your department, or would you, submit for
8 this Committee a written evaluation?

9 A. Yes, we would be glad to.

10 Q. I think it would be helpful.

11 Do you feel this, at the present time, in your pre-
12 audit practices that the Department of Finance have, by
13 indirection or direction, actually made policy decisions in
14 the Education Program?

15 A. May I answer the question pretty generally, Mr.
16 Hanna?

17 Q. Yes.

18 A. I think that every time someone controls anything,
19 they are setting policy. I think that every time the Legis-
20 lature appropriates money, they are setting policy, educa-
21 tional policy. I don't believe that you can get away from
22 it. We have tried to stay out of the education policy field
23 just as much as we could.

24 We feel that we have the right and the duty to ask
25 questions of what the money is to be spent for. I think the
26 philosophy goes back, Mr. Hanna, that the budget, as presented

1 to the Legislature, is built on a program. When the Legis-
2 lature then appropriates money, it is divided into, say,
3 operating expenses and equipment; but it is based on a pro-
4 gram that is submitted to them.

5 If conditions change after the appropriation is made, we
6 feel that we are obligated to change the budget as we go
7 along, and I believe the Government Code does give us that
8 right to do that.

9 Q. Well, let me ask you this:

10 In places where you have, in your pre-audit, made deter-
11 minations to deny utilization of funds, have you found that
12 there have been available to you a clear-cut and strong policy
13 on the part of the Department of Education so that you could
14 weigh the efficaciousness of that policy as against your
15 decision as to the spending of the money?

16 A. All requests come through the Department of Educa-
17 tion, and if there is substitution, for example, of money to
18 be used for one thing, rather than another, there is a justi-
19 fication for it, and we go over those justifications and talk
20 and communicate with the Department of Education as to the
21 reasons.

22 Q. Is your answer "yes" or "no"?

23 A. I am answering it with: The substitutions are made
24 and referred to the Department with sufficient justifications
25 given, yes.

26 Q. You feel that, so far as your trying to find the

1 policies and so on that are behind the request, that you have
2 always been able to find those?

3 A. Well, in cases where we do not find them, we send
4 them back.

5 Q. Have you had to do that very often?

6 A. Well, I think probably the volume is considerable
7 when you consider individual items. I don't think the per-
8 centage is very large, no.

9 ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: That is all.

10 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Doyle.

11 QUESTIONS BY ASSEMBLYMAN DOYLE:

12 Q. Mr. Whitsell, I brought this out with Mr. Jordan.
13 Your interest, again, is cost?

14 A. That is right. Fiscal Administration.

15 Q. So I will put the question to you: Under the pro-
16 posed Assembly Constitutional Amendment that was proposed
17 yesterday, you feel if that were passed and put on the
18 statute books that there would be a lack of budget control,
19 as far as your department is concerned?

20 A. Yes, I do, Mr. Doyle, and that is the reason that
21 we would recommend against this proposal.

22 Q. Now, do you feel also that the Legislature is the
23 final word on budgetary items or expenditures for any depart-
24 ment, including education, as far as the thinking -- or as
25 far as the Department of Finance is concerned?

26 In other words, do you follow the dictates, shall I say,

1 of the Legislature or are there times that you can overrule,
2 are overruled?

3 A. Well, that is a question that is a little hard to
4 answer and get the meaning over that I will try to give.

5 I would like to refer back to what I said to Mr. Hanna;
6 that the budget is based on a program. If that program is
7 then changed or the circumstance is changed where the program
8 should be modified, we feel that we should modify it.

9 The Legislature then has the right to come back to the
10 Department of Finance and find out why, or criticize or
11 take any action they feel proper. We feel that, during the
12 year when these conditions do arise, we cannot go to the
13 Legislature for advice from day to day, and we must make cer-
14 tain decisions as we go along, but those decisions are open
15 to scrutinization by the Legislature.

16 Q. Perhaps I should be more exclusive in getting the
17 feel of what we are talking about:

18 It is money. At the last budget session -- and there
19 are many of us here on the Ways and Means Committee -- the
20 Committee voted down certain funds for certain books.

21 Miss Donohoe introduced a measure, which I supported,
22 asking for this additional money. The Legislature turned it
23 down. The Board, through the Superintendent, felt that the
24 only choice they had was to get an opinion from the Attorney
25 General as to whether the Legislature could have that money
26 withheld or whether the Department could continue to withhold

1 that money or just where the jurisdiction lay.

2 Now, that just happened to be one incident. It could
3 have happened in the Department of Agriculture or Fish and
4 Game or somewhere else. My point is: The Legislature
5 spoke and voted down this additional money; there were monies,
6 as we all know, put up in advance, so the Department of
7 Finance went along with the Legislature.

8 The Department of Education went to the Attorney General
9 for an opinion. Now, where does that leave the Legislature
10 as far as their ruling, or their vote?

11 A. I think, if I am not mistaken, Mr. Doyle, the matter
12 is in the court at the present time and will be settled by
13 a court case as to what would happen on that. I think, as
14 always, the Legislature is subject to the Revising Board.

15 Q. That would be the question here, subject to review.
16 The Department of Finance will be going to court on this par-
17 ticular item, will they not?

18 A. I don't know whether they are a party to the suit
19 or not.

20 Q. Well, they have the money and how do they let go of
21 it?

22 A. Well, many times the Controller will go to the
23 courts on these cases because they are the ones that make
24 the payment and when they come up against a statute that
25 says money cannot be spent for a certain item, then they will
26 not protest the claim. It is the Controller that is really

1 the final stopping point.

2 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions?

3 Mr. Hegland.

4 QUESTIONS BY ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND:

5 Q. This is just a very general question: Talking about
6 the last five years generally, and trying, in your mind, to
7 make the situation comparable, would you say that the State
8 Board of Education and the State Department of Education have
9 been as effective before the Legislature and the people in
10 getting funds for their students on the higher educational
11 level as the Board of Regents on their level?

12 Shall I withdraw it and just make a comment instead?

13 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Let's have your observation on it.

14 ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: Let's put down that I am withdraw-
15 ing this question.

16 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions?

17 (No response.)

18 If not, I want to thank you, Mr. Whitsell, for being
19 here.

20 Now, we have Mr. Clouse, Chief of the Division of
21 Accounting.

22 Mr. Clouse.

23 ---oOo---

24 FLOYD CLOUSE,

25 appeared as a witness before the Sub-Committee and testified
26 as follows, to wit:

1 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Clouse , do you have a prepared
2 statement?

3 A. No, sir, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee,
4 we do not have any prepared statement. We are here as
5 observers. If there is any question we could help with, we
6 would be glad to try.

7 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Are there any questions of Mr.
8 Clouse?

9 (No response.)

10 ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: If there is any question we can
11 help with, we would be glad to try.

12 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Are there any questions?

13 (No response.)

14 ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: I want to say that he is repre-
15 senting a mighty fine man.

16 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: No questions. Thank you very much,
17 Mr. Clouse.

18 ---oOo---

19 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: It is time to adjourn for lunch.
20 We will take up at 2:00 o'clock.

21 ---oOo---

22 (Whereupon, at 12:00 o'clock noon, the Sub-Committee on
23 Higher Education recessed until 2:00 o'clock P.M., the same
24 day and place.)

25 ---oOo---

26

1 FRESNO STATE COLLEGE, FRESNO, CALIFORNIA

2 AFTERNOON SESSION

3 August 14, 1958

4 2:00 o'clock P.M.

5 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: The meeting will please come to
6 order.

7 Before we call our next witness, Assemblyman Collier
8 would like to make an observation.

9 ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER: Mr. Chairman, in alluding to a
10 recent article in the paper to the President's speech yes-
11 terday -- I am only alluding to that to make a point, and
12 that is:

13 Since the President made his talk yesterday about the
14 trouble we have been in in the Middle East, the President's
15 greater antagonists, Senator Morris, one of them, and Mr.
16 Humphrey -- but after that speech and after the incident that
17 led up to this Mid-East situation, Senator Morris made the
18 statement yesterday -- in paraphrasing what he said -- he is
19 proud to be an American since he heard the President's speech.

20 It took all these little incidents all the way along
21 in the Mid East to bring us to the unanimity of thinking in
22 our policy.

23 Now, I am of the opinion that the introduction of the
24 compilation of this resolution here, or this Constitutional
25 Amendment drawn by Mr. Simpson, has been a result of incidents
26 that have happened in the past.

1 One is we have submitted to the people Proposition 13,
2 that the Superintendent of Public Instruction should be sup-
3 ported by the Board of Education. Assemblyman Allen intro-
4 duced this bill here to set up a separate Board.

5 It has taken these little incidents in the past that
6 has brought this Committee here in it's search for a solution
7 to the problem, and I think it will become unanimity and we
8 will find a solution to this problem.

9 I think it is certainly appropriate for this Committee
10 here to go out and seek information in trying to resolve our
11 differences. I certainly disagree with Dr. Simpson when he
12 says that the Legislature is taking over the Executive.
13 I think the Legislature is supreme, excluding the Constitu-
14 tional provisions that limit our actions, and I think Mr. Jor-
15 dan made a very excellent explanation this morning in that
16 direction.

17 Now, my interest has run very deep in our solutions of
18 educational problems, and I wish to throw this out to the
19 Committee and to the participants this afternoon, and one
20 is this: I can't support Dr. Simpson's proposal. I think
21 we should have a separate Board of Education for our State
22 Colleges. I think that the Board of Education of our State
23 Colleges, if adopted, should appoint a President. That Presi-
24 dent should serve as an ex-officio member of the Board of
25 Regents of the University of California.

26 In turn, the President of the University of California

1 should serve as an ex-officio member of the State College
2 Board. In that way, you have the President of the State
3 College working with the University; you have the President
4 of the University working with the State College, and then you
5 are getting that liaison between.

6 I think that is a reasonable compromise in getting the
7 liaison between the State Colleges and the University.

8 I disagree very strongly with the statement Mr. Blair
9 made yesterday. I think he deleted the prestige and the
10 stature of our State Colleges in our professions when he made
11 the statement -- in trying to paraphrase his statement --
12 that our colleges are for vocational training, putting them
13 down into our terminal Junior College class.

14 I think our State Colleges have reached their maturity.
15 I think they have reached their adulthood right now, and I
16 feel that serious consideration should be given in that
17 direction. That is why I am suggesting a separate Board for
18 the Board of Education.

19 I think this: As a member of the State Education Commit-
20 tee, I have taken it upon myself to talk to teachers at the
21 grass roots level. Go down and talk to the teachers in your
22 district to find out what the problems are.

23 I think that we should talk more to the professors, the
24 assistant professors and the associate professors of the
25 colleges to get their views. I think some are here and I
26 think we should encourage those professors and assistant

1 professors to participate and help us at reaching a solution,
2 because I think we have a wealth of material at our hands.
3 I think the Presidents of the Colleges should take advantage
4 of that.

5 I am sure that some colleges are taking advantage of
6 that right now, but I am sure that there are some colleges
7 that do not deny their professors of expressing themselves,
8 and I think there should be meetings at colleges to let those
9 professors participate in arriving at the policy for the
10 State College.

11 Our present Board could be made the State College Board,
12 or the present Board could be the Board that has control and
13 supervision of our secondary and elementary schools.
14 I am for local autonomy, as much so as possible. Remember
15 that all of our Boards of Education at the local level are
16 elected Boards, and they are answerable to the people.

17 We need a Board of Education, the super structure so far
18 as your local school districts are concerned, for many reasons;
19 the topography of the State of California, the climatic condi-
20 tions, the economic and political climate in the schools.
21 We have kids transferring so often from one district to
22 another that we have to have uniformity of control at the
23 State level over our local school districts, and it is very
24 important that we do have a State Board of Education supervis-
25 ing above, so to speak, our local school districts.

26 That is, briefly, my suggestion here to you today.

1 This isn't final; it is one that I have come to after hearing
2 the testimony and thinking about this last night, and I felt
3 that I should make this observation now before it kind of
4 slipped out, so to speak.

5 I urge this body here that we can take Bruce Allen's
6 bill, which recommends a public school system with a College
7 State Board, and amend this bill to carry out this warning.
8 I would like to have the comments and the sentiments from the
9 Presidents that are here now and the professors that are here
10 as to what do they think of this proposal about having a
11 separate State Board with the President being appointed by
12 the Board, serving ex-officio on the Regents of the University
13 of California, the President of the University of California
14 serving as a member of the College State Board, and in that
15 manner I think we have arrived at a reasonable compromise.

16 I think this is really food for thought and maybe we
17 might have an answer that is a step in the direction of an
18 answer to the solution of this problem.

19 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you very much, Assemblyman
20 Collier.

21 At this time, I think Don Doyle has an observation he
22 wants to make.

23 ASSEMBLYMAN DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, mine isn't an obser-
24 vation. I would like to make a suggestion and if it is
25 necessary, I will put it in the form of a motion.

26 Now, you have heard Mr. Collier's suggestion, and I

1 have heard him make a lot of them, but I couldn't agree with
2 him more on the observation he made this morning. I agree
3 that we are on the way to a solution.

4 During Mr. Jordan's testimony -- and I think that Mr.
5 Whitsell brought it out, too -- Assemblyman Hanna made a
6 suggestion that we get certain suggestions and material and
7 that that come from the Board and Department, as well as
8 Finance.

9 I would like to suggest, at this time, from a personal
10 standpoint, and knowing of this man's interest in this par-
11 ticular thing we are talking about and the studies he has
12 made in the past, that this Committee write a letter to Dr.
13 Simpson, asking that Mr. Wren, one of the members of his
14 department, his assistant, Dale Wren, be assigned that task
15 for the Department.

16 ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONOHUE: I second the motion.

17 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: It has been regularly moved and
18 seconded that we send this letter for Assemblyman Doyle to
19 Mr. Simpson, after making this request. Are you ready for
20 the question?

21 (General assent.)

22 All those in favor signify by saying "aye".

23 (Whereupon, the aforementioned motion was passed
24 unanimously.)

25 ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: I would like to suggest that the
26 record show that it was unanimous.

1 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: I am going to ask Roy Stevens, the
2 Secretary of the State Personnel Board, if he has a few re-
3 marks he would like to offer.

4 ---oOo---

5 ROY STEVENS,
6 appeared as a witness before the Sub-Committee and testified
7 as follows, to wit:

8 MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I
9 shall try to be brief.

10 When we originally were asked at the Personnel Board
11 whether we wished to present testimony, we said, in essence,
12 we had no recommendation that we felt we could appropriately
13 make inasmuch as we act in this field of personnel in the
14 State Colleges purely by delegation of the State Legislature.

15 We neither ask for nor do we reject our responsibilities.
16 However, your consultant did ask us and suggest that we be
17 prepared to report to you in essence how we do operate, and
18 give you a little picture so that that might provide a
19 springboard to your more specific questions as to how the
20 Personnel Board goes about trying to fulfill the responsibili-
21 ties that the Legislature has assigned to it in connection
22 with the State Colleges.

23 In the background of this, there is the starting point
24 back in 1934, when there was a Constitutional Amendment
25 adopted by the people which says, among other things, that
26 the State Colleges were exempt from Civil Service and that it

1 was not within the power of the Legislature to bring them
2 into Civil Service.

3 There were some other agencies, like the prisons, that
4 were originally exempt and the Legislature did exercise to
5 bring them into Civil Service, so around 1950 was about the
6 beginning point. Until that time, the Personnel Board had
7 no responsibilities, no authority in the matters of personnel
8 in the State Colleges.

9 The starting point of the Legislature turning to the
10 Personnel Board was in connection with disciplinary matters
11 when the Legislature prescribed that employees of the State
12 Colleges should have the same protection afforded Civil
13 Service employees for an orderly hearing in connection with
14 disciplinary actions.

15 They prescribed that that hearing be upon the appeal
16 of an employee who had been dismissed, either academic or
17 non-academic, should be conducted by the Personnel Board,
18 just like Civil Service. There really have been just a
19 handful of those. A few employees have exercised that parti-
20 cular right, but there haven't been numerous cases. That
21 has been going on for about 10 years.

22 Then we come up to 1953. During all this time, the mat-
23 ter of salaries and the basic rules and decisions relating to
24 classification were being done first by the Department and
25 the salaries were subject to approval of Finance. Basically,
26 the Department of Education, the Board of Education, prescrib-

1 ed the salaries and had an approval power over them.

2 In 1953, according to my understanding -- although I
3 did not actually participate in it and no representative of
4 the Personnel Board actually appeared -- I believe in the
5 hearings connected with this matter on the basis of legisla-
6 tion sponsored by the employees of the State Colleges, the
7 responsibility was given to the Personnel Board to set the
8 salaries of the non-academic and the academic employees of the
9 State Colleges.

10 At that time, we entered into that picture. In 1955,
11 based upon the almost impossible task we were given --
12 particularly as far as the non-academic was concerned -- not
13 having any control over classification, we were expected to
14 put price tags on things we didn't know. It was a title, but
15 a title can cover a lot of things, if it hasn't been set up
16 on an orderly basis, and there was no full-fledged classifica-
17 tion planned so that you could rely upon the title to reflect
18 what the classification was actually doing.

19 In 1955, the employees went back to the Legislature to
20 see that we could classify the academic, as well as the classi-
21 fication authority; and in that, the frame work in which they
22 assigned duties and the groups in which they classified --
23 their academic group -- would remain with the Department of
24 Education.

25 So, they set up a frame work -- for example, they have
26 the classes of instructor and assistant instructor and certain

1 grades between those classes, and the Personnel Board then
2 puts the salary tag on them but does not have any authority
3 to prescribe how they shall group this academic personnel.

4 Beginning in 1955, there was the expanded authority and
5 it is from that that during the last three years the Personnel
6 Board has been actively trying to fulfill that responsibility.

7 I thought you might be interested in some of the things
8 that have been done, using this as an opportunity to sort of
9 report back to you about what we have actually done for
10 better work.

11 To begin with, in order to have a structure we could
12 operate -- the Department could operate with a knowledge of
13 what we were doing and the employees could operate with the
14 knowledge of what we were doing -- we sent a crew of three
15 people out for a year, who visited all of the State Colleges
16 and personally interviewed, as well as getting written job
17 descriptions from about 2,000 non-academic employees, and a
18 classification plan was set up to the extent that the Civil
19 Service classes measured up with the duties and the way they
20 were organized in the colleges.

21 We used the Civil Service standards so that an inter-
22 mediate clerk -- a person with that title in the colleges --
23 is doing a job that, in terms of type of duty, is comparable
24 to an intermediate clerk, for instance, in the Division of
25 Highways here.

26 On the other hand, they have some specialties that didn't

1 exist in Civil Service and we set up written descriptions
2 so that there were standards against which they could operate
3 and make their decisions.

4 In the case of the colleges, they do not include minimum
5 qualifications. We have no control over their hiring. They
6 decide completely independently what education or experience
7 they will ask of a particular employee, and there are no pre-
8 scribed standards, either by them or by us, as to measuring
9 a -- I should qualify that. As I stop to think about it, I
10 heard second hand that they were working on some standards
11 and there may be some standards that I have not personally
12 become familiar with as to their minimum qualifications in
13 hiring.

14 As a result of this particular survey -- which took a
15 year to accomplish and was adopted in August, 1956 --
16 approximately 10 percent of the non-academic people were recom-
17 mended for promotion. The duties they were performing war-
18 ranted a higher pay than they have been receiving. Of 262,
19 about 20 percent of them recommended changes in classifica-
20 tion; no change in salary but from a classification standpoint,
21 the description of the job and matching up with the standards.
22 Maybe a person who was called an "intermediate clerk" was
23 doing the work of a truck driver. O.K. You should call him
24 a "truck driver", but they should be transferred even though
25 there was no change in salary.

26 There were about 45 demotions that were recommended as a

1 result of this audit of what actually existed in the State
2 Colleges.

3 Since that time, during the regular process of public
4 hearings and staff work, that plan has been kept up to date
5 by either the Department or the employees. Any person who
6 has an interest in it and a legitimate reason -- or, actually,
7 it needn't be too legitimate -- can put in a request and ask
8 for a review of these specifications of standards that are
9 required and the staff report in writing, and there is a pub-
10 lic hearing before which anyone that is interested can appear
11 and present their recommendations as to the basic standards.

12 All of this has been in the frame work of the non-
13 academic at this point and it has provided the non-academic
14 people, for the first time in the history of the colleges,
15 an orderly frame work in which they and the management can
16 operate from the standpoint of the jobs that they do and the
17 classification of salary recognition.

18 In the matter of the academic salaries: In 1953, after
19 that initial legislation and after public hearings, a salary
20 plan, based upon the classifications established by the
21 Department, was adopted. Since that time, there have been
22 various requests and hearings in connection with salary in-
23 creases and there have been rather major salary increases
24 since '52.

25 In one picture on that, at the time of this take-over of
26 this responsibility, the top salary for a professor was

1 \$584.00 a month. The top salary for the professor at the
2 present time is \$905.00 a month. That is a 12-month year,
3 about \$10,800 for the nine months, plus additional money for
4 the summer session.

5 My main point here is that it has not been neglected as
6 evidenced by the things that have occurred. The academic
7 salaries have been increased a minimum of five percent every
8 time there has been a general increase program and, in some
9 cases, have been increased 10 percent, and at one point, the
10 professors were increased 15 percent.

11 On the other hand, some requests have been turned down,
12 that is true, with other State agencies. Every year the
13 Personnel Board does turn down requests, either because they
14 don't measure up to the standards of the Legislature, as
15 prescribed, or because the funds are not there to do them.
16 Last year the Personnel Board turned down \$2,000,000 worth of
17 increases, State-wide, including some in the State Colleges.
18 That is, of course, a control that all of the State agencies
19 would like to have released. We get known best for the times
20 we turn them down and least for the times that we grant them.
21 We grant them only within the frame work of our understanding
22 of the wishes of the Legislature.

23 We report annually to you our best estimate as to what
24 the situation is; whatever decision you make, we respect it
25 and try to fully comply with it. I think California has,
26 through it's legislative process, an enviable record in main-

1 taining it's basic salary structure better than most govern-
2 mental jurisdictions.

3 I didn't mean to start on that much of a plug. I am
4 just trying to report.

5 In the working force of the State Colleges, there are
6 3,460, according to our last count, which was January of this
7 year, in the full-time academic group. I have excluded the
8 part-time and seasonal people, and 2,295 in the non-academic.

9 The whole goal, of course, and the thing that you must
10 demand of us is that in the end we facilitate efficiency and
11 economy in the government. If we ever really fail in that
12 goal, we need some overhauling in our efforts in that direc-
13 tion.

14 I was distressed to have it implied -- I wanted to find
15 out more about it and I haven't had a chance yet -- we were
16 among those that were frustrating the educational policy of
17 the State of California. That is a pretty serious charge
18 when you think about it, and I hope our denials of some matters
19 and differences of viewpoint will not mean that we are really
20 frustrating, but it will, perhaps, mean that out of it, there
21 is order and direction that will be on the positive side.

22 The main contributions that we have made, I believe, are
23 in providing the classification plan and in providing the
24 matter of standards and criteria and orderly hearing process
25 through which, in the end, everybody gets a chance to be
26 heard.

1 As far as we are concerned, anybody can be heard, whether
2 it is the janitor or the top man, and anybody can have our
3 analysis. All people can sit down with the staff in developing
4 that analysis, and then an annual report goes back to the
5 Legislature in an orderly way.

6 I have made this sound more like a plug than I intended,
7 really. Our Board is not recommending and I am not authorized
8 to give any recommendations as to where you place this parti-
9 cular responsibility.

10 The same type of service could certainly be done under
11 a different organizational set-up. I think I would certainly
12 recommend some basic principles on which we operate to such
13 an organizational set-up.

14 There are many different viewpoints and we are not
15 either asking for or running away from that particular respon-
16 sibility.

17 I will terminate my formal presentation. If there are
18 questions, I will be glad to answer them.

19 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Collier.

20 QUESTIONS BY ASSEMBLYMAN COLLIER:

21 Q. Number 1, in addition to the academic attainment of
22 a professor, which you classify, does the Personnel Board
23 give any consideration to the merit rating of a professor or
24 as to the outcome of the product that he is producing in his
25 classroom?

26 Number 2, do they take into consideration extra activities

1 that a professor enters into on a college campus? There are
2 many things that he will do on the campus, showing his inter-
3 est in bettering the college, and are you taking into consider-
4 ation that -- and I am sure we will have some, just like the
5 production line, where the professor will get there just in
6 time, like the man in the production line, to put in the plot
7 and as soon as the time is over and the line stops, he goes
8 home.

9 Now, isn't there some kind of a merit rating that you
10 use in arriving at a salary schedule for those that are making
11 a greater contribution to our educational system?

12 A. Under existing legislation, we have no authority in
13 that field and have done nothing in that field.

14 Q. In other words, you do not take in those things?

15 A. No, we have no authority to do it in the Department.
16 If they wish to formulate a program of what you might call
17 "distinguished professors", or a program of the persons who
18 are more outstanding in the professorial ranks, and are
19 sharing the greater responsibility, as far as we are concerned
20 we would be happy to put a salary tag on it, but we don't
21 have authority to prescribe a method of selection or any pro-
22 gram of that type.

23 Q. Well, now, have they come up with any recommendation
24 to you in attaining that objective?

25 A. About a year ago, there was an initial recommenda-
26 tion on that. They had some difficulty. I am not saying

1 this critically. They went through their request; they spent
2 time on it. Exactly where it stands, I don't know, but, in
3 the final analysis, there has been no formal request to us.
4 They started to make a request and then they backed off from
5 it.

6 Q. Has there been proper liaison between Personnel and
7 the State Colleges, as far as trying to resolve this problem?

8 A. There is definite difficulty. As a matter of fact,
9 some of us were talking, both last night and today, in the
10 terms of the College Presidents, about trying to get away
11 from some of the problems we have had of their entering into
12 salary proposals before the Legislature, of which we were
13 unaware, and of your having to refute information that they
14 had presented. It has been very embarrassing to both them
15 and to us.

16 Well, last week, as a result of an informal meeting with
17 some of the members of the Board of Education, our Board, at
18 their request, requested me to, in the future, attend their
19 meetings, and some of the Presidents have indicated that they,
20 as a total group, would like to sit down with our Board, as a
21 total Board, just with the purpose of exchanging ideas.

22 Q. I want to say to you in my 12 years tour of duty in
23 the Legislature that yesterday was the first time in the his-
24 tory of my tour of duty that the Superintendent of Public In-
25 struction and all Board members were sitting before a legally
26 constituted committee of the Legislature, and I think this

1 type of meeting will help us in arriving at a solution as
2 to this higher education problem. I am all for it.

3 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Assemblywoman Donohoe.

4 QUESTIONS BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONOHOE:

5 Q. Well, carrying on Mr. Collier's statement, I was
6 there five years before I saw a living, breathing member of
7 the State Board.

8 Now, I want to go back to this bombshell of the merit
9 system, which is actually what we have been talking about.
10 Does the University of California have a system of tenure?

11 A. I hesitate to try to answer questions about the --

12 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Could Mr. Corley's assistant back
13 there answer it?

14 MISS PALMER: I think it does, yes.

15 ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONOHOE: I know the State Colleges do.

16 MR. STEVENS: I was going to say that, generally speak-
17 ing, in the University you have tenure upon reaching the
18 rank of Associate Professor. Well, wouldn't the normal asking
19 of your department for statements from the chiefs of each
20 division of education of State Colleges and Universities
21 designating outstanding service for the "beyond the call of
22 duty" range eliminate what I think is really the only evil
23 of tenure, and that is, let's face it, we have a good many
24 that are safe and secure. Some small percentage, true, but
25 we are just stuck with those who will not and do not assume
26 any obligation beyond the very minimum standards. Yet they

1 draw the same pay as the men or the women who give above and
2 beyond the call of duty.

3 If we made an attempt in that measure to fix that situa-
4 tion, wouldn't that eliminate one of the evils of tenure?

5 MR. STEVENS: On the surface, yes, if you can get such
6 a plan. Now, they point out all kinds of lines to differentiate
7 between persons in the professional field.

8 Q. If we are going to shy away from things that are
9 rough, we had better not go into this question at all.

10 A. Well, my Board members publicly indicated that we
11 have developed a plan that we would like to live with.

12 Q. Just to say "it is hard, it can't be done," isn't
13 the answer. Some of the things that have been accomplished
14 in this world were by people who never thought things were
15 impossible. We should try to evaluate extracurricular acti-
16 vities like staying after class and inspiring one group, or
17 even one individual person, making out of them someone that
18 is going to do something; those are the types of recognition
19 that we could try to evaluate. At least, we could try, but
20 I am getting awfully tired of administrators that say, "It
21 is a problem, it can't be done" because things have been done
22 that people say are impossible.

23 I hope your Department can work with the State Board of
24 Education and establish whether or not it is fair for us to
25 try just salaries in proportions. You get awfully tired of
26 seeing those that serve hundreds of man hours a year drawing

1 the same compensations as those who merely get there when the
2 bell has rung, and when it rings again, knock the students
3 down to get out to the golf course.

4 A. Well, we have tried to work constructively. We try
5 to do our part on any of these problems.

6 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: I think Mr. Anderson has a question.

7 QUESTIONS BY ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON:

8 Q. Do you perform any personnel service for the
9 University?

10 A. No, we do not.

11 Q. Do you have any opinion on Dr. Simpson's Constitu-
12 tional Amendment?

13 A. No, I was specifically not authorized by my Board
14 to express an opinion because it is in an area where we
15 would have only one little facet. You have a total big
16 problem and you, for the moment, have delegated no duty to us.

17 There certainly could be other answers and maybe better
18 answers. They didn't try to arrive at a recommendation.
19 They didn't feel it was appropriate.

20 ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: That is all.

21 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Hanna.

22 QUESTIONS BY ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA:

23 Q. To get more specifically how you operate with the
24 Board of Education, I have a series of questions which relate
25 to a specific position and I can see how this works.

26 I have before me a release on the California State

1 Personnel Board specifications for the class of consultant
2 in State College curriculum.

3 I will ask you, first of all, who determined that
4 class, the Personnel Board or the Department of Education?

5 A. The Department would request it and we would establish
6 it, based upon the budgetary authorization of the program by
7 the Legislature.

8 Q. Now, the definition of this particular class is given
9 as follows: "That under general direction to study the pur-
10 pose and organization of State College curricula, particularly
11 as to admission requirements and the requirements of staff
12 building it's facilities and equipment" -- who determined this
13 definition? The Department of Education or the Personnel
14 Board or both?

15 A. It was written on the basis of the duties of the
16 Department of Education assigned. It merely tries to be a
17 mirror of what they assign. We have no idea what, we merely
18 try to reflect what they assign.

19 Q. And it outlines the different tasks which, more or
20 less specifically, relate to this business of analyzing
21 proposed curricula and developing requirements for persons to
22 be educated? In other words, this is admission requirements
23 and the facilities to be used to given education? Did you
24 have a staff or any member of your staff make a study of
25 this or was this development of typical tasks a result of
26 something that was handed to you from the Board of Education?

1 A. They may have originated a rough draft. Sometimes
2 they do; sometimes they don't, but a staff man would have gone
3 over and personally discussed and asked questions and probed
4 as to be sure that we had the picture and were reflecting for
5 them the picture of what actually was to exist, in this case,
6 it was a job that was being created and it was based upon the
7 information that they gave us. One of our regular staff men
8 would have gone into the agency and talked about the appropriate
9 people immediately responsible for that.

10 Q. Then, would you say that primarily this material was
11 directly from the Department of Education?

12 A. Written up in our words.

13 Q. Written up in your words. Now, we get to the final
14 thing here, which is designated "minimum qualifications"
15 and for this job it is indicated that there shall be an exper-
16 ience of three years of increasing responsibility in adminis-
17 trative teaching or educational research experience in higher
18 education. I presume that means that this experience could
19 have been all in high school or all in junior college; is
20 this true? Where it has this word "experience in secondary
21 or higher education"?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And it calls for an education of "graduation from
24 college with specialization in curriculum development and
25 evaluation". Now, I ask you, who determined these minimum
26 qualifications? Was this developed in your department or were

1 these minimum qualifications developed by the Department?

2 A. It would have been jointly, based upon our staff
3 men getting a picture from them as to what they thought and
4 comparing the standards we already had, trying to keep a uni-
5 form deal even though they are different jobs, and trying to
6 keep it within the frame work of trying to be a minimum that
7 is realistic. Letting in the people that are trying to do
8 the work; letting out those who probably shouldn't even be
9 trying to get in the place, and trying to tailor it to parti-
10 cular individuals so you try to be sure that competition
11 isn't going to be artificially restricted by writing up re-
12 quirements that let in a particular person.

13 In the final analysis, this thing is in a public hearing
14 to the Personnel Board. A representative of the Department,
15 a representative who has worked at it, appear at the hearing
16 and any employees or any individuals, and if they have any
17 objections to any parts of that question -- the validity of
18 any part of it -- they have the opportunity to do so.

19 At that hearing, then, the thing becomes official when
20 adopted by the action of the members of the Personnel Board.

21 Q. May I ask you whether or not notices of such meetings
22 go to representative organizations of faculty members?

23 A. The notices go to anyone who has indicated an
24 interest in the field. We have an extensive list. To answer
25 this particular one, I don't know.

26 Q. Have you been present at any one of these hearings?

1 A. Yes, I attend all of them.

2 Q. To your knowledge, do you recall any representative
3 appearing and speaking on behalf of faculty members at these
4 hearings?

5 A. Faculty people have been to our hearings. They
6 appear frequently.

7 Q. And in this particular regard, we have gone over
8 this particular case, is it a non-academic or an academic
9 classification?

10 A. This particular classification, within the things
11 I have said, would still be true in the State Colleges. It
12 is actually the Department of Education itself, rather than
13 the colleges, but the questions you have asked would have
14 been equally apropos if you had asked a class that was in the
15 State Colleges.

16 This is in the headquarters of the Office of Education.

17 Q. And this would have been considered neither an
18 academic or non-academic but administrative; is that correct?

19 A. That is right, and in reviewing these classes that
20 are actually in the headquarters office, this is one of the
21 things the Board does is try to keep internal relations
22 simple between the Board and the Education Office so they
23 don't get them competing against each other.

24 Q. How is the salary for this job established?

25 A. It is established by the Personnel Board within
26 the frame work of pay for comparable type of work. That

1 particular one, to be specific, would have been primarily to
2 the internal relationships to the other types of jobs in
3 that department.

4 Q. Would there be no comparable position in the Univer-
5 sity set-up?

6 A. Actually, I don't know.

7 Q. Have you ever made any comparisons with University
8 pay scales and classifications in determining either the
9 qualifications or the pay scale for jobs in the State Colleges?

10 A. In connection with the academic of the State Colleges,
11 there is an exchange of information. In the non-academic
12 field, we are not closely familiar with their classification
13 plan and we don't compare directly to it because, in a sense,
14 we would be comparing them with ourselves. They, among other
15 things, often compare our salaries. It gets to be a dog
16 chasing it's tail when we turn around and compare directly
17 to them. In general, the answer would be "no".

18 Q. The answer generally is "no"?

19 A. That is right.

20 ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Thank you. That is all.

21 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions?

22 (No response.)

23 We want to thank you, Mr. Stevens, for the testimony.

24 I am going to call Mrs. Patterson Goodrich from the
25 American Association of University Women.

26 ----oOo----

MRS. PATTERSON GOODRICH,

appeared as a witness before the Sub-Committee and testified as follows, to wit:

MRS. GOODRICH: The California State Division of the American Association of University Women has been concerned for some time with the need for autonomy of our State Colleges.

The rapid growth of our State's population has forced the State College to assume a greater share of the burden of educating our youth than was envisaged at the time the present set-up of our colleges and their administration was brought into being. The several restudies of the needs of higher education which the Legislature has authorized clearly shows this development.

There are now 12 separate State Colleges and the Legislature is being requested constantly to create new colleges in other areas. Each of these campuses is required to perform certain similar services, but because of the differences in the locales many of them are required to perform widely differing services. Six of them are located in urban areas, but at least one of them (Sacramento) also serves agricultural areas. Five of them are located in rural areas, but must offer more than a purely agricultural program.

How great the differences in the needs of each community; what the requirements are in terms of faculty, equipment, land, monies for each campus, are all problems requiring the careful consideration of a group charged with the specific

1 responsibility of meeting the needs of the State Colleges, as
2 is the case with the Board of Regents of the University of
3 California.

4 We believe that such a set-up would prevent the inter-
5 vention of other agencies of the State government in the
6 handling of purely educational policy decisions.

7 A suggestion of the State Superintendent of Instruction,
8 Mr. Roy Simpson, has been brought to our attention, but since
9 it contains several suggestions on which our organization has
10 taken no stand as yet, we would like to have the opportunity
11 of presenting our views to you regarding this matter at a
12 later date.

13 We are in favor of measures to give autonomy to our
14 State College system and we hope that something can be develop-
15 ed through this Committee to give our State Colleges the
16 autonomy, prestige, dignity and status that their fine work
17 well deserves.

18 May I express to this Committee the appreciation of my
19 organization and myself for this opportunity to present our
20 views to you at this time.

21 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you very much. Are there
22 any questions?

23 ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONOHUE: Mr. Chairman, I would just like
24 to make a personal observation, if I might, and hope that
25 Mrs. Goodrich takes it back to her State group.

26 I would like to let you know how fine a job you have

1 done in Sacramento and how much we appreciate the legislative
2 efforts of your organization and hope that you continue.

3 MRS. GOODRICH: Thank you very much, Mrs. Donohoe.

4 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you very much, Mrs. Goodrich.

5 Mrs. Goodrich, would your organization submit to the
6 Committee in writing your idea on the subject that has been
7 discussed here as far as the Simpson Plan is concerned?

8 MRS. GOODRICH: I believe we would be very happy to have
9 that opportunity but I don't think we could do it until the
10 12th of October.

11 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: That will be fine.

12 Now, the next witness is Arthur Misner, for the Associa-
13 tion of California State College Instructors.

14 ARTHUR J. MISNER,

15 appeared as a witness before the Sub-Committee and testified
16 as follows, to wit:

17 MR. MISNER: Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee,
18 my name is Arthur J. Misner. I am with the Department of
19 Government at Los Angeles State College. My special field
20 at Los Angeles is Public Administration. Although I am
21 appearing here today as a representative of the Association
22 of California State College Instructors, I want to point out
23 that I am also the President of the Los Angeles State College
24 Chapter of the California State Employees Association.

25 I have had some experience in the administration of
26 higher education. I was with the Administrative Analyst of

1 the Office of the President of the University of California
2 for two and a half years, and a Special Advisor to Chancellor
3 Kerr, who is now President of the University of California,
4 for 14 months. I did my Doctor's Dissertation in the field
5 of Administration of Higher Education.

6 I would like to introduce the two gentlemen with me,
7 who will assist in the presentation, and in answering any
8 questions the Committee may want to put to us.

9 On my left, Professor Richard Bigger from San Diego
10 State College, and on my right, Professor Richard Wilder,
11 Long Beach State College.

12 The Committee has copies of the official presentation,
13 and rather than trying to read all of this because we are
14 getting along in time, I thought I would summarize some of
15 the more important parts and not take up too much time for
16 that, and give more time for questions; also, for other
17 people who wish to appear.

18 The first thing that I would like to point out is that
19 the Association of California State College Instructors feels
20 that a basic reorganization is necessary and after careful
21 study is prepared to make the following recommendations:

22 1. To amend Article IX, Section 6, of the Constitution
23 of the State of California, by deleting in the second para-
24 graph, the first sentence, the words "and State Colleges" and
25 deleting from the same Article, Section and paragraph, in the
26 second sentence, the words "or college".

1 2. To support in Article IX a new Section 16, which
2 would read approximately as follows: "There is hereby estab-
3 lished a system of California State Colleges. The State Legis-
4 lature shall pass such laws as may be necessary to carry into
5 effect the program of higher education assigned to the State
6 Colleges."

7 Now, I am sure that the Committee is aware that such a
8 Constitutional Amendment -- or the idea, at least, of such a
9 Constitutional Amendment - is not necessarily original with
10 this Association. That is, you know we are here because of a
11 bill which will do pretty much the same thing, and we want to
12 have the members of the Committee realize that we don't hold
13 any original concept with this particular idea.

14 Although our study committees and the several faculties
15 have supported the separate Board idea, we have purposely
16 written the proposed Constitutional Amendment in such a manner
17 as to allow the State Legislature the opportunity to determine
18 the exact administrative organization which their investigation
19 finds will best serve the interest of the people of the State
20 of California.

21 In making this determination, the Association of Califor-
22 nia State College Instructors and the California State Employees'
23 Association, both in the organization and in the personal member-
24 ship since, offer their services to the Legislature to the end
25 that the administrative organization which is developed will
26 represent the highest type of educational administration.

1 Now, to give an even clearer picture of the position
2 taken by the faculties of the State Colleges, I should like to
3 present at this time a "Statement of Objectives for the State
4 College System", which was developed and adopted jointly by
5 the Association of California State College Instructors and
6 the California State Employees' Association:

7 1. The administration and operation of the State College
8 System should be entirely separate from the secondary and
9 elementary school systems in the State of California.

10 2. The administration and operation of the State College
11 System should be separated completely from the State Depart-
12 ment of Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction,
13 and the State Board of Education.

14 3. This should be accomplished by a "Constitutional
15 Amendment".

16 4. A separate lay Board for the State College System,
17 appointed by the Governor, should be established and the
18 Board's primary function should be the development of general
19 educational policies for the State Colleges. The Board should
20 not become involved in the ordinary processes of administra-
21 tion.

22 5. The State College Board should appoint a Chief Ad-
23 ministrative Officer, whose qualifications should include
24 teaching and administrative experience in a major institution
25 of higher education.

26 As a note to the last two points that I have made, the

1 Sub-Committee that developed this, which was a Joint Committee
2 of the CSA and ACSCI, pointed out that it would be one alterna-
3 tive to have a single administrative head of a department,
4 rather than the Board itself, if the Legislature decided this
5 was the best way to accomplish the objectives. We might have
6 a single administrative head appointed, but without a Board.
7 This would include the concept of a Department of Higher Educa-
8 tion, such as this.

9 6. In establishing the agency to administer the State
10 Colleges, recognition should be given to the regional nature
11 of the program. Each State College should be enabled to
12 develop educational programs to meet the requirements of the
13 region served by the College, and it should be given as much
14 local autonomy as is compatible with the general policies
15 established by the State.

16 We are suggesting the divorce of the State College Sys-
17 tem from the Public School System of the State of California
18 for a number of reasons. First, is the changing role of the
19 State Colleges since 1935, which indicates that teacher-train-
20 ing is no longer the singular function of these institutions.
21 This is not to imply that the Association of California State
22 College Instructors does not recognize the importance of
23 teacher-training in the Colleges, but represents a conclusion
24 that this function is only one of many important services to be
25 provided by the State Colleges.

26 Now, yesterday there seemed to be some interest by the

1 Committee in the statistical number -- or the percentage number
2 -- of graduates from State Colleges that received educational
3 degrees. We have some material, if I am correct, on this, put
4 out by the State Department of Education, which indicates that
5 in the school year 1956-57, taking all of the State Colleges
6 together, 35.8 percent of all of the graduates were granted
7 teaching credentials.

8 In other words, just a little over one-third of all the
9 graduates of State Colleges. When these figures are compared--
10 the other statistics we have -- for example, you will note in
11 there some statistics on the percentage of teachers trained
12 in California Colleges, and I think you will find, as you look
13 at these, that they indicate the percentage of people that
14 are taking teacher-training in the State Colleges, when com-
15 pared with the enrollment figures for the State Colleges, the
16 Universities and the private schools, will indicate, I think,
17 very clearly that the percentage of teacher-training in each
18 of these three types of institutions is approximately the same
19 as the enrollment percentage relationships.

20 The import of these figures is that the teacher-training
21 function in State Colleges, while important, no longer holds
22 the dominant position it once enjoyed, and, further, that the
23 role of State Colleges is now equally as broad as that of other
24 institutions of higher education in California.

25 Still another indication of the change in the basic
26 functions of the State Colleges is that of graduate study, and

1 in the degrees now being granted outside the field of teacher-
2 training. I refer specifically to the recently authorized
3 Masters of Arts, Masters of Science and Engineering Degrees --
4 and to the already substantial enrollments in these programs
5 at the graduate level, which indicates the gradual broadening
6 of the functional base in State Colleges.

7 The second reason that -- and I think that it isn't
8 necessary to elaborate on it -- but a second reason for the
9 divorce of the State Colleges from the present administrative
10 organization, as far as the ACSCI is concerned, is the increas-
11 ing size and complexity of the State Colleges of California.

12 Turning to the inadequacies of the present system, we
13 should like to present several outstanding instances in which
14 the State Colleges, and thereby the People of the State of
15 California, are "short-changed" in the direction and control of
16 higher education.

17 First, there seems to be overwhelming evidence to indi-
18 cate that the State Board of Education has such a wide range
19 of responsibilities that it is unable to give sufficient and
20 proper attention to the operation of the State Colleges, to say
21 nothing of consideration of questions of major policy. As you
22 will note in here, there is a summary of material from the
23 Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education for the
24 McConnell Report.

25 I would like to just read this one, which gives an idea
26 of this range of responsibilities because I think it is impor-

1 tant that everyone realize that broad aspect and broad range
2 of responsibilities that the State Board has.

3 The State Board "authorizes textbook lists for elementary
4 and secondary schools; approves courses of instruction for the
5 Junior Colleges; authorizes the School Districts in the State;
6 issues credentials for teaching in all these schools; accredits
7 teacher education institutions, both public and private;
8 studies the educational conditions and the needs of the State
9 and reports them to the Governor; acts as the official agent to
10 carry out Congressional Provisions for vocational education;
11 fixes standards for entitling districts to receive State aid;
12 adopts minimum standards for courses of study in kindergarten,
13 elementary and secondary schools; purchases textbooks rights;
14 hears cases and passes on revocation of teaching credentials;
15 makes rules and regulations for governing the State Department
16 of Education, the State Library, the State Colleges; and
17 through the Department of Education, formulates rules and regu-
18 lations for the schools for the blind and the deaf; supervises
19 schools for palsied children; acts as the Teacher Retirement
20 Board.

21 "In addition to these and other duties, it exercises
22 general supervision over the Public School System of the State."

23 I think the McConnell Report points out very clearly the
24 fact that the State Colleges do not receive sufficient atten-
25 tion at the Board meetings at the present time. The Associa-
26 tion of California State College Instructors has done addition-

1 al research since the publication of the McConnell Report by
2 going through the minutes, and in that, we find that the State
3 Board of Education devoted, in the period from January, 1956
4 to September, 1957, approximately 48 hours total time to the
5 problem of the State Colleges of California.

6 As the McConnell Report has so aptly illustrated, the
7 Board of Regents give approximately 20 times as much effort
8 to the problems of the University of California.

9 Because the State Board of Education is unable to devote
10 sufficient attention to the State Colleges, the policy in ad-
11 ministrative problems devolve on the Department of Education.
12 Therefore, the ACSCI has concerned itself with the basic
13 attitudes, philosophy, orientation of the officials of the
14 Department of Education and the resulting administrative frame-
15 work, which has been developed for the operation of the State
16 College Program.

17 One of the fundamental tenets of good administration
18 is that, "A supervisor should be as competent in his field as
19 the people he supervises".

20 Investigation by the Association of California State
21 College Instructors indicates that this is hardly the situation
22 in the State College System. At the local level, the academic
23 staffs of the several Colleges are supervised by individuals
24 selected by the Department of Education, who, for the most
25 part, are trained and philosophically oriented towards the
26 elementary and secondary level of education, which leaves grave

1 deficiencies in the academic disciplines; more than this is
2 the fact that they are usually unsympathetic to the fundamental
3 philosophy of higher education. At the State level, the State
4 Colleges are supervised by a Division of State Colleges and
5 Teacher Education staffed almost exclusively by individuals
6 trained in and with experience only in the area of elementary
7 and secondary education.

8 What is needed in the administrative positions of higher
9 education at both the local and State level are people trained,
10 experienced and oriented towards University and College educa-
11 tion, and whose background and professional interest places
12 them in positions of leadership in higher education.

13 It is, unfortunately, our conclusion that this condition
14 is unattainable within the present philosophical orientation
15 of the State Department of Education.

16 In addition to the size of the State College System, when
17 administered as an integral part of the Public School System,
18 the problem of administration and control become very
19 difficult. The span of control of the Department, attempting
20 to coordinate and administer not only the elementary, secondary
21 and special schools of the State, but the State Colleges as
22 well, insures inefficiency and lack of policy control which
23 can result only in lowering the standards and offerings in
24 higher education.

25 Now, I noted that both yesterday and today there have
26 been a number of references to the question of faculty partici-

1 pation in the State Colleges in the establishment of adminis-
2 trative policies, and I think that it has been obvious from
3 the testimony already given that there is little or none.
4 The Committee will note, on Page 10, that I go into this in
5 some detail, particularly with reference to the Board of Educa-
6 tion. I think this is a particularly important part because
7 of this lack of faculty participation indicates the lack of
8 appreciation by the State Department of Education of the basic
9 philosophy of higher education which anticipates faculty parti-
10 cipation as a method of securing the most feasible and accept-
11 able policy and as an example of democracy in action.

12 Now, we have in here, in addition, a number of specific
13 examples to indicate some of the things that have made us
14 realize that -- or I suppose I should say "forced us", really,
15 to come to some conclusions and to appear here today in favor
16 of the general idea and philosophy of the bill.

17 Some of these things have already been talked of in
18 other testimony and I would just like to call them to your
19 attention again.

20 One point was that in 1949, the State Legislature authori-
21 zed the State Colleges to award general Liberal Arts Masters
22 Degrees separate from those traditionally granted in connection
23 with teaching credentials. It wasn't until Spring of 1958
24 that this Master Degree was finally approved by the State Board
25 of Education and permission granted to the State Colleges to
26 award this degree and in some instances they have yet to receive

1 specific approval for particular subject degrees. During this
2 interim, many of the State Colleges were possessed of staff
3 and facilities fully qualified to give such degrees, but the
4 State Department of Education did not see fit to bring this
5 matter before the State Board of Education until the pressure
6 of public opinion forced their hand.

7 I have also reference in here to the Engineering Degree,
8 but I am sure that most of you are so aware of that it does
9 not need mentioning.

10 It is well known that research is an integral part of
11 any higher educational program, both in the institutional ob-
12 jectives and in the maintenance of the competence of the academ-
13 ic staff. Until very recently, research was not only discour-
14 aged but almost prohibited by the philosophy and regulations
15 of the Department of Education.

16 After considerable pressure by the faculties, and in some
17 instances by local administrators, a new policy was adopted,
18 permitting one percent of the total professional time on the
19 campus to be allocated to research. This is, of course, en-
20 tirely inadequate and fails to realize the following condi-
21 tions:

22 a. Research is necessary to keep students and pro-
23 fessors abreast of the subject. The real
24 vitality of teaching stems from the professor's
25 opportunity to bring to his students the current
26 developments in the field. This can only result

1 when opportunity is given to spend time on research
2 of the work of others and on matters of original
3 interest to the professor.

4 b. Institutions which do not permit research find it
5 difficult to recruit well-trained college professors
6 who desire to live in an intellectually inspiring
7 environment, and it is generally agreed throughout
8 the profession that research and competent teaching
9 are inseparable.

10 c. The lack of opportunity to do research at the colleges--
11 and certainly the present policy is inadequate to
12 counter this situation,-- has deprived and will con-
13 tinue to deprive the people of the State of Califor-
14 nia of the fruits of such intellectual activity.
15 In these perilous times, when national and interna-
16 tional attention is focused on the need to "find
17 the answers" to both physical and social questions,
18 the philosophical orientation of the State Department
19 of Education in opposition to research can only be
20 described as imprudent.

21 ASSEMBLYMAN DOYLE: Pardon me, did you want to continue
22 b at the top of Page 13?

23 MR. MISNER: No, I put that in for the Committee. I
24 think that it is self-explanatory.

25 We feel that, under the existing arrangements, the State
26 Colleges have done a reasonably competent job of turning out

1 well-educated students despite the difficulties imposed by
2 the present system. The people of California deserve the
3 finest system of higher education. It is our firm conviction
4 that adoption of the proposal presented here today will provide
5 the frame-work within which this system may be developed.

6 I think that those are the points that we wanted to
7 present and we will attempt, of course, to answer any questions
8 the Committee may have.

9 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Does the Committee have any questions?
10 Mr. Anderson.

11 QUESTIONS BY ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON:

12 Q. Mr. Misner, can you tell us a little bit about this
13 organization? What percentage of faculty members are you
14 representing?

15 A. Yes. I want to make it clear that this presenta-
16 tion includes both organizations together. I would say that
17 we would represent between 80 and 90 percent of the total
18 faculty of the State Colleges of California, between those
19 two organizations.

20 Q. I take it you are opposed, then, to Dr. Simpson's
21 Constitutional Amendment?

22 A. Yes, sir. It puts me in a peculiar position because
23 the Committee -- the men that have met here who, I believe,
24 represent the viewpoints of the faculty, are all in opposition
25 to Mr. Simpson's proposal.

26 I couldn't say that is the official position of the two

1 organizations because we have not had sufficient time for
2 both organizations to get together or to meet and actually
3 take action.

4 On the basis of our five point objectives, there is no
5 question that Mr. Simpson's proposal would certainly not be
6 acceptable to the members of the two organizations.

7 I might also mention that it was never presented to either
8 the Association of California State College Instructors or to
9 the State College Committee of the California State Employees'
10 Association.

11 Q. One more question: Several have offered during this
12 hearing, in testimony, that this Liaison Committee should be
13 legalized to the point of having, perhaps, some above both
14 State College System and the University of California.

15 What would be your reaction to that idea?

16 A. Assemblyman Anderson, we have not taken an official
17 position on it. I could speak from a personal standpoint.

18 I think that the Legislature would want to investigate
19 this carefully. I wouldn't say that I would be opposed, and
20 I don't think the organizations would if the Legislature feels
21 that this is one device. Certainly, there have been a lot of
22 discussions at various meetings among the faculty about the
23 problem of coordination between the University and the State
24 Colleges, and I think that there is a lot of interest in it,
25 but I couldn't give an official position from either of the
26 organizations' standpoints.

1 I made a note and I forgot to include it here. Assembly-
2 man Collier had asked that we react to his proposal, and I
3 couldn't, again, speak for the organizations because it was
4 just presented, but from a personal standpoint, this sounds
5 like a very fine idea to me. It might well solve some of the
6 problems we find between -- the liaison problem between the
7 University and the State Colleges now.

8 I think it has merit, and certainly both organizations,
9 I am sure, will take this matter up and give it very serious
10 consideration.

11 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions?

12 Mr. Hanna?

13 QUESTIONS BY ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA:

14 Q. I have three questions: The first reflects back to
15 your testimony about the percentage of graduates in all State
16 Colleges, who received teaching credentials. I think you
17 said 25.8 percent. You followed that by saying, I believe,
18 that this percentage would be about the same for graduates of
19 the University and private colleges; is this true?

20 A. Oh, no. I am sorry; I was skipping over some
21 material there. What I meant was that the other figures that
22 we have indicated there of the teachers trained in California,
23 the figure of 37.17 percent were trained in colleges. They
24 are the teachers that received credentials.

25 When the figures of those trained by the University of
26 California and in private colleges were compared with the total

1 enrollments for the respective institutions, it is found that
2 the teacher-training indicated in each of the three types of
3 institutions is approximately the same. That other figure I
4 threw in because we didn't have that other figure before and
5 there seemed to be confusion about it.

6 Q. I wanted to clarify that relationship.

7 Then, on Page 8, you discuss the separation from the
8 Department of Education, you indicate a difference of philo-
9 sophy in a manner which seems to indicate that you think the
10 philosophy of the present Department and therefore to some ex-
11 tent the Board of Education, is not as suitable for higher
12 education as it is for the elementary, secondary education.

13 Would you kind of enlarge upon that so that we see what
14 the basis for that conclusion is?

15 A. Well, I would suggest that this represents my view.
16 I think it is the difference in philosophy between the elemen-
17 tary and secondary schools and higher education. It revolves,
18 I suppose, around a number of factors, the general concept of
19 the scholar, the approach, and, from the administrative stand-
20 point, I think particularly, and this, I think, is the real
21 difficulty or the real problem here; that in the elementary and
22 secondary schools, the faculty, as far as the administration
23 are concerned, the faculties are pretty much -- well, to use
24 an expression, "hired hand".

25 It is tradition throughout the major institutions, the
26 institutions of first rate scholarship and first rate standing

1 in the Country, that the faculty in those institutions are
2 recognized as having competence and ability to participate in
3 the development of educational policy. Many times, in the
4 actual administration of programs, there is a closer relation-
5 ship -- I think is the best word -- between the administration
6 and the faculty.

7 There isn't the bulk that exists in the Public School
8 System and part of this, I think, can be traced to the fact
9 that in the Public School System, the idea that an administra-
10 tor makes a career -- leaves the classroom and makes a career
11 out of administration.

12 In the major institutions, the major Universities, not
13 all of them but many of the administrators are faculty or
14 scholars first, and administrators second.

15 Incidentally, now, this creates from the administrative
16 side -- and I spent a good deal of time when I did my Doctor's
17 on this -- this creates a bit of difficulty, but I think it
18 tends to benefit the academic and educational aspects. I
19 think some of the things that have gone on at the University
20 of California recently -- but I have a quote here, which might
21 be of interest. This is from the San Francisco Chronicle,
22 dated July 13, 1958. This is Secretary Simpson, after one of
23 the Board meetings at which they were discussing a faculty
24 administrative problem: "I am not willing to have any discus-
25 sion on that. Any trend of faculty participation, as we know
26 it, in the University is conflicting with our aims in the State

1 College."

2 Q. Before we leave this, do you think it the proper
3 attitude for us to consider the teachers in the elementary
4 schools as "hired hands"?

5 A. No, very frankly I don't. We are getting into
6 another area and this would be a personal opinion, but I think
7 that there could be a good deal of change in the administration
8 of the elementary and secondary schools, which could benefit
9 education.

10 Q. My third question: On Page 12, you refer to the need
11 for research as an integral part of higher education. I think
12 that some of us on the Committee and some in the lay public
13 may look on this word of "research" as carrying with it a con-
14 cept of a huge laboratory and expensive materials, and so
15 forth.

16 What is your definition of "research" as utilized in
17 this concept?

18 A. If I may make one comment on that: I think part of
19 this is because the University has tended to convince the pub-
20 lic and sometimes some of the Legislators that research -- any
21 time you talk about research, you are talking about cyclo-
22 trons and such things as this.

23 The State College faculties, I think, are reasonable
24 enough to realize that the amount of research that we can do
25 and the research projects that we could carry on probably may
26 have to be limited to some extent, certainly, because of the

1 financial problems involved.

2 However, the opportunity to -- primarily, we are interest-
3 ed in the opportunity to have time to do research. We have
4 good facilities at Los Angeles State, which we have just opened
5 -- I am not sure it is completely accepted yet -- a science
6 building, which has over 40 laboratories and I understand, from
7 one of the men from Cal Tech, that it is one of the finest
8 laboratories he has ever seen.

9 The thing is, with the amount of teaching time and policy
10 which does not encourage research, we do not mean that every
11 man is going to do research for some State College men may not
12 ever want to do research in the concept of going out and doing
13 something in the purely original sense, but when a man does
14 have -- and on the State College faculties now, particularly,
15 in recent years, we have gotten scholars of the first order,
16 many of our men made national reputations. They don't have
17 the opportunity to do this, and I think that not only do we
18 lose men because of this but the scholars, professors, lose;
19 the students lose and the people of the State of California
20 lose because there is no reason why these men can't produce.

21 Q. Well, let me ask you this and then see if I help in
22 your answer. As a lawyer, that is something I can understand.

23 Now, as a lawyer, I like to feel that I can utilize a
24 portion of my time to keep up with the changes that are taking
25 place in those fields of law in which some of my practice will
26 lie. Once in awhile I may get a case which I hope may contri-

1 bute something to the building of the law.

2 In your utilization of the word "research", does it
3 include more this type of thing than inventing the psychotron
4 or making a sputnik?

5 A. Yes, yes, it would include that as well as the origi-
6 nal research.

7 In other words, there are different types. One example
8 of this: I know many of you are familiar with the fact of
9 metropolitan problems. This is the time to go out and investi-
10 gate and try to work on this problem. It isn't a laboratory
11 project, it is a very applied project, and some of my professors
12 at the University don't think this is really research.

13 When I use the word "research", I am thinking of the
14 broad sense, but when we feel that we have something to offer,
15 we should be given the opportunity to offer it and be
16 encouraged.

17 MR. WILDER: I was going to say that one of the important
18 elements in research in the Colleges is to attract money from
19 Ford Foundation and other agencies, which will grant money for
20 this purpose.

21 We are under an interesting penalty in the State College,
22 which I think, in some ways, a little fantastic, but if you
23 go to leave for a year to do research or even to take a posi-
24 tion as a visiting lecturer at the inviting university -- which
25 I would think would be a contribution to personal stature and
26 reflect upon the College advantageously -- you are rewarded with

1 a five percent loss in salary because you don't go with your
2 five percent salary steps; in other words, when you take leave,
3 you abandon your rights to the system completely. This is
4 really a penalty for engaging in what is a good, common thing
5 in the academic world; that is, moving about the Country, from
6 College to College, and learning by this new ideas, getting
7 into new areas and bringing back with you a great deal of en-
8 richment, which you can pass on to your students.

9 This is something which we have discussed from time to
10 time, but there is no immediate solution. It is something
11 which has to be pursued.

12 There are many questions of this sort, which shows that
13 the whole conception of these institutions is growing up and
14 is participating in a world of scholarship and academic
15 activity beyond the confines of their own brick walls. They
16 are not being provided for.

17 I would say at Long Beach State College we have received
18 money from Congressional Granting Agencies in the field of
19 science. Some of our men are presently at work on our campus
20 with several very interesting projects, which perhaps one of
21 our science men can tell you more about later.

22 These are projects which do not require the enormous
23 expense and facilities, which may be extremely useful. Further-
24 more, as community colleges, I think we ought to reflect about
25 what the service to the community means.

26 MR. BIGGER: If I may just say a word. Sometimes policy

1 against research has not permitted a State College to accept
2 a gift from a private institution of some value that will per-
3 mit faculty members to use it to engage in research. I am
4 thinking of some of the things in the physical sciences. I
5 know that it has happened once or twice in San Diego State
6 College.

7 ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONOHUE: I would just like for the record,
8 I think probably, too, you are thinking of the kind of research
9 that is being done at San Francisco State College, and I think
10 there is someone here from San Francisco State, who is probably
11 more familiar than I. I can recall when a grant was almost
12 lost because of the conflict of opinions between the Department
13 of Finance and the State Department of Education as to whether
14 or not it could be done. It was finally obtained and the re-
15 sult is that four different people are now on the campus here,
16 outstanding in the field of mental retardation.

17 A few months ago, I heard that they may come up with
18 something by which they can ascertain at an early age a child's
19 potential in retardation, which we have never been able to do,
20 and the fantastic success that they have met there in this
21 element of pure research is going into the field, now, of
22 audio-visual and the hard-of-hearing.

23 Again, with the tremendous job of moving the Cerebral
24 Palsy School from the University campus, where they are train-
25 ing these teachers so they go out with the actual experience
26 of having done what they are teaching other people to do. They

1 are not teaching it in theory.

2 I think one of the valuable things is to teach these
3 teachers the things that cannot be taught in a textbook, and
4 I think that the success at San Francisco State should be a real
5 contribution to other colleges being able to receive the same
6 kind of assistance; thereby doing a tremendous job.

7 If every college were doing what is being done in San
8 Francisco, we would make a tremendous contribution to humanity.

9 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions?

10 ASSEMBLYMAN DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, I think, perhaps, we
11 should settle this matter now, once and for all, as to the
12 number of hours or days the State Board is able to put into
13 State College work.

14 It has been stated before in presentations that approxi-
15 mately 50 percent of the time has been spent on State College
16 activities; and it has been stated here that 48 hours, which
17 would mean six days, figuring eight hours a day. Where they
18 only meet 18 days, or 144 hours, about a third of the time,
19 we say, have been spent on State Colleges in California.

20 So, it boils down to the fact that that isn't enough
21 time. The present Board doesn't have enough meetings to do
22 the job, even under the present system.

23 Would you agree with that?

24 MR. MISNER: Yes. I think that it is too wide a variety
25 and there isn't enough time spent on it. With so many things
26 to do, I am not sure that they could get people to serve and

1 to do what they would think would be an adequate job.

2 I might mention that we do have some copies of the number
3 and types and the things that were done between '56 and '57
4 on this. We will leave some of these and I think it will give
5 you a better idea of the things that we were thinking of.

6 ASSEMBLYMAN DOYLE: Under the present set-up, if they
7 spend more time on State Colleges, they would have to spend
8 less time on Junior Colleges and high schools, etc., so it is
9 a matter of looking at the overall schedule. There just isn't
10 enough time to do the job?

11 MR. MISNER: Yes. That is the reason we compared it
12 with the Regents, rather than comparing it with the Board
13 itself.

14 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions?

15 (No response.)

16 If not, I want to thank you gentlemen for your testi-
17 mony. We appreciate it very much.

18 Our next witnesses will be G. A. McCallum, Professor
19 at San Jose State College, and, I believe, Mr. McElheney.

20 G. A. McCALLUM,

21 AND

22 JOHN W. McELHENY

23 appeared as witnesses before the Sub-Committee and testified
24 as follows, to wit:

25 MR. McELHENY: Mr. Chairman, and members of the Com-
26 mittee, I am John McElheney, Chief Counsel of the California

1 State Employees' Association, and with me is Dr. G. A.
2 McCallum, Professor at San Jose State College.

3 Since the inception of the State College System, the
4 California State Employees' Association has been particularly
5 interested in it's development. Over a period of 10 years,
6 we have had a Committee of the Association, State College
7 Committee, which has concerned itself with the many problems
8 that have arisen in the State College System.

9 Over the last three years, that Committee has been par-
10 ticularly concerned with the study of the question of the
11 separation of the State College System from the Department of
12 Education.

13 Last year the State College Committee recommended and
14 the Board of Directors of the California State Employees'
15 Association adopted in principle the proposal Dr. Misner has
16 just presented to this Committee, the form of Constitutional
17 Amendment to separate.

18 This year the State College Committee has recommended to
19 the Board the approval of this proposal. Dr. McCallum has
20 been a member on the State College Committee for many years,
21 and I would like him to tell you of the work of that Committee
22 in this area.

23 DR. McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee,
24 I am Dr. McCallum, San Jose State College. I have been a mem-
25 ber of the State College Committee of CSEA for the past 10
26 years, and as has just been stated, we have studied this problem

1 as long as I can remember, and in the last three years have
2 put in a number of hours of very serious consideration to it.

3 I would like also to say that during all of our delibera-
4 tions, we have always invited a member of the State Department
5 of Education staff to meet with us and at least one member of
6 the staff has always been present at our meetings. Occasion-
7 ally his ears were a little bit burned, occasionally ours
8 were, but we met and did all of our deliberations in front of
9 him.

10 We felt that it was proper that the Department of Educa-
11 tion should be informed as to our thinking. We have not made
12 any attempt to hide what we have been doing and our thoughts.

13 These deliberations have finally come up with the state-
14 ment of objectives that you have in the paper handed to you
15 by Dr. Misner, at the bottom of Page 3 and top of Page 4.

16 I would like to briefly point out our objectives again.
17 Those are: That the administration and operation of the
18 State College System should be entirely separate from the
19 secondary and elementary systems in the State of California.
20 The administration and operation of the State College System
21 should be separated completely from the State Department of
22 Education, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and
23 the State Board of Education.

24 We are recommending the establishment of a separate
25 lay Board, whose primary function shall be to develop the
26 general education policies for the State Colleges, and not be-

1 come involved in ordinary processes of administration. We
2 are recommending that a Chief Administrative Officer, whose
3 qualifications should include teaching and administrative
4 experience in a major institution of higher learning, be
5 appointed.

6 We also recommend that each State College should be
7 enabled to develop educational programs to meet the require-
8 ments of the region served by that college and should be given
9 as much local autonomy as is compatible with the general
10 policies which are established.

11 These conclusions were reached, as I have stated, after
12 several years of discussion. The reasons that we believe
13 this separation to be necessary are many. You have already
14 heard a number of reasons. I would like to briefly state a
15 few of the more important ones.

16 All of the studies which have been presented have called
17 for a separation. The State Colleges, as you know, have
18 grown in the number of institutions, in the number of students,
19 the broadness of curriculum, in the major objectives, and yet
20 they are under essentially the same administrative set-up as
21 when they were normal schools in 1921. That was brought out
22 in testimony yesterday.

23 The State Director of Education is and must be largely
24 concerned with the elementary and secondary education of the
25 State. He should be trained and experienced in the field of
26 elementary and secondary education. His staff should be trained

1 in that field. At the present time the staff of the Depart-
2 ment of Education is primarily trained in the elementary and
3 secondary field.

4 The State Colleges must have a Director trained in
5 college or university administration if the 52,000 or more
6 students in a State College System are to receive the type
7 of college education that they deserve.

8 The State Colleges must have a department which will
9 vigorously push for the things which are essential to this
10 program. The whole Department, not just a portion of it, must
11 concern itself with matters of finance, personnel and buildings,
12 and so on.

13 The present members of the Department of Education who
14 are doing these jobs are but a small portion of the entire
15 Department. They were trained in elementary or secondary prob-
16 lems of personnel and finance.

17 In the elementary and secondary schools, these are
18 handled largely on the local level, whereas in the present
19 State set-up, matters of finance are handled by the Legisla-
20 ture and the Department of Finance. The present Department
21 has failed to convince the Department of Finance and sometimes
22 the Legislature of it's needs.

23 We feel that a separate Department of State Colleges
24 would be much more effective in this area where the whole
25 Department were devoting it's efforts to these ends.

26 The present Department has failed to understand the

1 true college situation in many respects. Some of those have
2 been pointed out by the previous speaker.

3 I might mention two phases, which are important in
4 college personnel.

5 One is that of sabbatical leave. The State College
6 System has a sabbatical leave law, which is inferior to most
7 of the sabbatical leave regulations in the private colleges of
8 California. It is inferior to the sabbatical leave regulations
9 in the secondary schools of the City of Los Angeles.

10 The Department has come before the Legislature in an
11 effort to remedy this but never has it become a vigorous fight
12 on the part of the Department.

13 Another very important thing pointed out by the previous
14 speaker is that of research. It has been pointed out that
15 just recently was research recognized as a possible function of
16 a college professor, while in academic circles it has long
17 been established that it is essential for a good teacher, for
18 student stimulation and for public service.

19 Since the State Department of Education must be oriented
20 towards the elementary and secondary schools, the State College
21 Committee of CSEA feels that the State Colleges are now large
22 enough and broad enough to justify a separate department with
23 a director and his staff trained in college or university
24 administration, a director and staff who will understand the
25 college functions, the faculty and student responsibilities,
26 the needs for faculty participation in research, development

1 and other activities which are normal to colleges and univer-
2 sities; a director and staff, who devote their entire time to
3 providing the type of educational environment essential to
4 the education of over 50,000 college students in the State of
5 California, students majoring in a large number of fields.

6 We feel that the above proposal will provide such a
7 program.

8 Thank you for your time.

9 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any questions by the Committee?

10 (No response.)

11 Do you wish to call?

12 MR. McELHENEY: Mr. Chairman, the California State
13 Employees' Association have always worked closely with other
14 groups that are interested in and concerned with the problems
15 in the development of the State College System.

16 The Association of California State College Instructors
17 is such a group, and another group that we have worked closely
18 with is the Department of Association of University Professors.

19 I would like to ask Dr. Dean Cresap, Professor
20 of San Jose State College, to come forward.

21 ---oOo---

22 DEAN CRESAP,

23 appeared as a witness before the Sub-Committee and testified
24 as follows, to wit:

25 My name is Dean Cresap. I am a Profes-
26 sor at San Jose State College. I think I should mention that

1 this presentation is an expression of my own opinions. I do
2 not speak for the College as a whole, of course.

3 I have the rather unhappy task, I think, in that I wish
4 to summarize what seems to me at least three stories of
5 friction between the State Department of Education and the
6 State College faculty.

7 I will try to be brief: One stems from the differences
8 in theories of education, and I hope perhaps this may answer
9 some of the points raised by Mr. Hanna during the last day or
10 two.

11 As we all know, the elementary and secondary schools
12 are required to take care of a great variety of youngsters;
13 the bright and the dull, and the average and those who hunger
14 for learning and those who attend school because they are
15 forced to.

16 Under such circumstances, the tradition of the educated
17 man sets a standard of achievement for all students, which,
18 for many, seems to be impossible. As a result, during the last
19 30 or so years, there has been a shift of emphasis in the
20 lower public schools away from intellectual achievement and
21 towards other aspects of -- if I may use the term "child
22 development" that seemed more possible of attainment.

23 For example, there has been a greater stress on develop-
24 ing children's social instinct, greater emphasis on developing
25 manual training and manual arts. Indeed, it seems that a lot
26 goes to the tap root of occupying the student's attention.

1 In other words, paper drives, pep rallies and other forms of
2 entertainment, and of course with these activities has been
3 developed a philosophy of education to justify that.

4 College education, however, is another matter. Young
5 men and women are not required to attend college. Those who
6 do attend must measure up to standards of performance, and
7 those who graduate represent a rather high level of intelli-
8 gence. In other words, colleges serve a somewhat select group
9 and the colleges are still interested, primarily, in intellec-
10 tual achievement, the preservation of and search for knowledge,
11 which, incidentally, would be my interpretation of the term
12 "research".

13 Even in the field of occupational training, the colleges
14 try to limit their efforts to only those fields that require
15 a somewhat vigorous and intense preparation.

16 As a result, theories of education that might be right
17 for the lower public schools are bitterly resented by college
18 faculties when applied to colleges.

19 Nevertheless, personnel within the State Department of
20 Education are recruited, for the most part, from the elemen-
21 tary and secondary school systems and from school departments
22 of teacher training. Quite naturally, these teachers bring with
23 them to the Department, the public school attitude, and as long
24 as they are expected to supervise the colleges, I am afraid
25 we can expect nothing but the present antagonism.

26 Now, a second cause of friction has to do with the

1 academic background. One of the distinguishing characteristics
2 of elementary and secondary school administrators, nowadays,
3 is that nearly all of them hold graduate degrees in the field
4 of education, or, teacher training, as it is sometimes called.

5 The education code, of course, contributes to this situa-
6 tion. One must have taken numerable courses in education in
7 order to qualify for an administrative position.

8 The typical college or university administration staff
9 is considerably different. One usually finds a great variety
10 of instructional departments represented among the Presidents
11 and Deans. Please notice the ditto sheet entitled, "Need of
12 Academic Specialization of State College Administrative Per-
13 sonnel" that is passed among you. This shows the results of
14 a study that is now underway but not yet completed. I think
15 enough information is available, though, to make the impres-
16 sion that is intended.

17 Here we have a list of all of the College Presidents and
18 Vice-Presidents and Deans and some of the members of the
19 Department of Education, their highest academic degree. I
20 want you to notice particularly the right hand column and
21 notice the frequency with which the field of education is
22 represented.

23 On Page 2, for example, there are 36 names; 32 of the
24 people represented there received their degrees in the field
25 of education, and so it goes.

26 Now, merely by way of contrast, and that is all it is,

1 the President of Stanford is an historian; the President of
2 the University of California, chemist; the Chancellor at
3 Berkeley is a chemist; the Chancellor at Los Angeles has re-
4 ceived a degree in medicine; the Provost at Riverside, in
5 zoology; the Provost at Davis, in entomology. One can examine
6 the general administrative staff at any one of these campuses
7 and find a great variety of departments represented. Litera-
8 ture, art, philosophy, engineering and some education.

9 Now, whether the exclusive control by one group is
10 important in influencing the character of the State Colleges,
11 I don't know, but I do know that again and again and again
12 members of the faculties of the various campuses have expressed
13 resentment regarding this situation, and it is said that
14 since the State Department of Education is staffed by School
15 of Education people; that as long as the control of the
16 administrative appointments remains in the State Department
17 of Education, there is little chance of an appreciable change.

18 Now, I feel compelled to say this in behalf of the School
19 of Education people. They are not all alike by any means.
20 They do not all believe that the end of education is together-
21 ness and social adjustments. This is not a pleasant task for
22 me to present this material because the members of the Depart-
23 ment of Education are my professional colleagues. Many of
24 those that occupy the administrative offices of San Jose are
25 my friends. I cannot think of one that I don't like; I simply
26 wish that so many of them were not so monotonously alike as

1 to their academic background. It would be almost as bad if all
2 of them were political scientists, which I happen to be.

3 Now, a third cause of friction between the State Depart-
4 ment of Education and the State College faculties results in
5 difference in theories of administration, particularly as to
6 the policy-making aspects of administration.

7 The State Department of Education involves rather closely
8 the theory of staff, their alignment, authority, centralized
9 rigid chain of command, and there is a tendency towards stan-
10 dardized regulations applicable to all the colleges that ignore
11 differences in skills, character and other considerations which
12 make the colleges divergent in nature.

13 The responsibilities of the faculties in the policy-making
14 process are ill-defined. However, it is the general impression
15 that the State Department of Education takes an unfavorable view
16 of the development of policy, either local or State-wide, with
17 the college faculties.

18 The clipping from the Chronicle, which was read a moment
19 ago, seems to substantiate that observation.

20 Now, a college is a unique institution. It is not like
21 a military establishment, nor is it like most business corpora-
22 tions. Faculty members are not disinterested workers on an
23 assembly line. On the contrary, a faculty is a community of
24 scholars intensely interested in the product of their joint
25 efforts. Indeed, their individual professional reputations de-
26 pend, in large measure, on the respectability of the colleges

1 in which they work. They have a very acute interest in college
2 policy, and, traditionally, college faculties have played a
3 large role in the determination of college policy.

4 During the last few weeks, I have been acting as a visit-
5 ing professor at the University of California at Los Angeles,
6 and I have been especially interested in a few of my colleagues
7 working on important policy-making committees.

8 One was on a State-wide committee to determine the func-
9 tion of and the relationship between the various campuses of
10 the University. Another was on a committee to determine en-
11 trance requirements for students. Another was Chairman of the
12 Building Committee to work out arrangements with architects
13 for the design of a new multi-storied structure. Another was
14 on a committee to pass on the appointment of a new faculty
15 member, and another was on a committee to determine whether
16 the appointment of a colleague to a deanship should be renewed.

17 Almost without exception, recommendations of these com-
18 mittees are accepted. As a point of contrast, let me refer
19 to the unsatisfactory attempt by the State Department of Educa-
20 tion to define the proper role of the State Colleges, especial-
21 ly as compared to the University and the Junior Colleges.
22 The most recent definition was prepared by experts in the Simp-
23 son office, not by the college faculties, and the results were
24 appallingly sad. How much wiser it would have been to elicit
25 opinions from the faculties and to establish a Joint Faculty
26 Committee from the various State Colleges, Universities and

1 Junior Colleges.

2 In the first place, I believe that a more satisfactory
3 solution would have been developed, but, second, even if the
4 solution were not satisfactory, the faculties would have no
5 one but themselves to blame. As it is, faculty organizations
6 are deprived of responsibility and must rely on pressure groups
7 and turn to Legislative Committees, such as this, for relief.

8 I wish to emphasize, indeed, that practice varies from
9 campus to campus, and I hope I do not put my own President on
10 the spot with Mr. Simpson's office by saying that he has en-
11 couraged a great deal of faculty participation.

12 On other campuses, the situation is, indeed, disgraceful.

13 Now, just a final observation: The State Colleges were
14 established originally as adjuncts of the elementary-secondary
15 schools with the primary purpose of old normal schools to pro-
16 vide public school teachers. Quite naturally, the normal
17 schools fell under the supervision of the public school people
18 in the Department of Education. Today, as you all know, the
19 colleges have expanded far beyond this teacher training func-
20 tion. They have a destiny of their own and they deserve an
21 administration of their own.

22 Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any questions?

24 (No response.)

25 If not, then we will have your next witness.

26 MR. McILHENNY: Mr. Chairman, we have in the audience

1 representatives of the faculties of practically every State
2 College in the State of California, and with the permission of
3 the Chairman, I would like to call on one person from each of
4 the campuses represented to say just a brief word.

5 We have already heard from San Jose State, of course,
6 and we have from Humboldt State College, Dr. Ross Y. Koen.

7 ---oOo---

8 ROSS Y. KOEN,

9 appeared as a witness before the Sub-Committee and testified
10 as follows, to wit:

11 MR. KOEN: I am Ross Koen, Humboldt State College. I
12 represent the Association of California State College Instruc-
13 tors and Humboldt State College here at this hearing.

14 Some question has been raised as to how many of the
15 faculty we actually represent. You people here on the Committee
16 are well aware of the fact that those of us who are here are
17 almost unanimous; in fact, I think we are unanimous in our
18 support of a separate State Board.

19 Just for your information and for the record, the ACSCI
20 membership of Humboldt State College is about 97 percent of
21 the faculty. We held a specific meeting in January in which
22 we took up this question of whether or not the faculty wanted
23 to go on record in favor of a separate State College Board.
24 Two-thirds of the members of the faculty were present -- that
25 is, the members of the organization were present, and the vote
26 in favor of a separate State College Board was unanimous.

1 I might just add a personal note here, if I may. I
2 think one of the reasons why there is this unanimity of senti-
3 ment in favor of a separate State College Board -- I came to
4 Humboldt State College two years ago from the University of
5 Florida, where I had taught for the previous eight years.
6 When I was approached about coming to Humboldt State, one of
7 the first questions I asked was, "Is Humboldt State a teachers
8 college?". The answer that I received was, "No, the word
9 'teachers' has now been dropped from the official designation
10 of the college".

11 When I arrived, I found that in practice this was more
12 of a teachers college than it was in law, as far as that was
13 concerned.

14 The reason that I asked the question in the first place
15 was because I did not want to be associated, affiliated with
16 a teachers college. I am a political scientist. My interest
17 in my own reputation, my professional reputation, would pre-
18 clude my going to a teachers college.

19 The reason, I think, that Humboldt State College, for
20 example, is today more a teachers college in fact than it is
21 legally is very clearly illustrated by the fact that before
22 this Committee yesterday, both Mr. Blair and Dr. Simpson re-
23 peatedly referred to the State Colleges as "teacher colleges".

24 Now, this may have been a mere slip of the tongue, but
25 I think that it does illustrate the viewpoints which they
26 generally bring to the matters concerning the State Colleges.

1 This leads to another point that I would like to make.
2 In his presentation before the Committee yesterday afternoon,
3 Dr. Joyal suggested that the difference in viewpoints between
4 the College Presidents and the faculties was merely one of
5 organization and was not fundamental. I would suggest that
6 the difference is not merely one of organization but does con-
7 cern what is fundamental.

8 Dr. Joyal -- and I think he was speaking for the State
9 College Presidents as a group -- believes that the fundamental
10 necessity at the present time is to gain autonomy for the
11 State Colleges from the Department of Finance, the Personnel
12 Division, the Legislative Analysts, and so forth.

13 The faculty believe that what is fundamental at the pre-
14 sent time is for State Colleges to gain autonomy from the
15 State Department of Education, to secure a separate governing
16 board, composed of people acquainted with and sympathetic to
17 higher education.

18 We believe -- and I think this has been clearly demon-
19 strated by the group which is present here at this meeting
20 now -- in the need for such a Board to also be independent of
21 Finance personnel and the Legislative Analysts, and that a
22 strong Board can work with these agencies, rather than present-
23 ing a situation in which there is constant conflict between
24 them.

25 For that reason, I wanted to make this specific presenta-
26 tion supporting this separate Board for the California State

1 Colleges.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you very much. If there are
4 no questions, we will have the next witness.

5 MR. McELHENEY: Dr. N. Field Winn, Chico State College.

6 ---oOo---

7 N. FIELD WINN,

8 appeared as a witness before the Sub-Committee and testified
9 as follows, to wit:

10 MR. WINN: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I am
11 Field Winn, representing Chico State College Chapter of the
12 Association of California State College Instructors.

13 I note that the afternoon is wearing on very rapidly,
14 and it is a long, long way home. I feel that the testimony
15 already presented has set forth very accurately the position
16 of the State College faculties in support of the separate
17 State College Board.

18 ~~I shall add only a brief statement:~~ I should like to
19 point out, however, that our faculty organizations at Chico
20 State College -- and practically all of the faculty members
21 are included in the AAUP and ACSCI and CSEA. Our faculty
22 organizations voted unanimously in favor of the principle of
23 a separate Board.

24 I might present very briefly some of the thinking that
25 led us to this action. First, the present organization of
26 education in California appears to regard the elementary,

1 secondary and State College System as a kind of continuum in
2 which all too frequently the first year of college becomes,
3 really, the fifth year of high school and graduate work becomes
4 simply the fifth year of college.

5 It is true, of course, that the State Colleges at
6 Chico and elsewhere accept ~~money~~^{MANY} students. It must accept
7 ~~money~~^{MANY} students who, for various reasons -- temperament, train-
8 ing, adjustment -- are not very well adapted to college work.
9 Most of these students drop out during the first year, even
10 during the first semester, so that eventually in the last
11 three years of college work, these colleges purely become in-
12 stitutions of higher education with the problems that are quite
13 distinct from those problems of the public schools.

14 Second, during the past several years, the character of
15 the State College faculties has, in my estimation, changed a
16 very great deal. In Chico, especially, we have been hiring
17 vigorous and intelligent young men, whose training and orienta-
18 tion and interests, particularly in scholarship and research,
19 do not predispose them to stay in a system which limits their
20 activities and offers them insufficient for their talents.

21 I have seen some of these men lost to the State of Cali-
22 fornia, and I firmly believe that we shall lose more of them.

23 Third, also, I think the training of teachers is an
24 extremely important function of the State Colleges, and is not
25 to be minimized. It certainly is no longer the only function.
26 I think it was mentioned the other day that our figure is

1 50 percent. I think we are now a little bit under that, but,
2 even so, we should recognize the fact that good teaching
3 thrives on breadth and depth of knowledge, and that, above all
4 else, a good teacher must be a liberally educated man.

5 I don't wish to disparage the efforts and activities of
6 the present Board but I believe I can speak for my organization
7 when I say that any Board which must be concerned primarily
8 with the public schools is not likely to have either the time
9 or the philosophical orientation necessary to the continued
10 growth and well-being of the State Colleges in California.

11 These, then, are primary reasons for supporting the
12 principle of the separate State Boards.

13 Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you very much.

15 I believe Mr. Doyle has a question.

16 ASSEMBLYMAN DOYLE: Mr. Winn, how do you get along with
17 your College President in Chico?

18 Well, maybe I should phrase that another way. The
19 gentleman from San Jose mentioned that his organization worked
20 very closely with the President of the College. So, I ask you,
21 in your organization from Chico State, do you have this same
22 working relationship with your President?

23 MR. WINN: We usually inform the President of our
24 activities. I should tell you that I am the incoming Presi-
25 dent, brand new this year. I haven't very much basis to speak
26 on. I don't think he worries very much about us, as a matter

1 of fact.

2 ASSEMBLYMAN DOYLE: Well, I think that may be one of
3 the reasons why we, seemingly, have such a gap today.

4 MR. WINN: I would like to see a closer relationship
5 between faculty organizations and the administration.

6 ASSEMBLYMAN DOYLE: As I see it here from the testimony
7 today and that of yesterday, the College Presidents are going
8 one way and your group is going another.

9 MR. WINN: That is true.

10 ASSEMBLYMAN DOYLE: At least, they are not together.

11 MR. WINN: I think we all want the same thing for the
12 State Colleges but we see a different way of getting it.

13 ASSEMBLYMAN DOYLE: I didn't mean to be facetious, but
14 I would like to find the answer.

15 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Are there any other questions?

16 (No response.)

17 MR. McELHENEY: From Fresno State College, Victor J.
18 Jepsen.

19 ----oOo---

20 VICTOR L. JEPSEN,

21 appeared as a witness before the Sub-Committee and testified
22 as follows, to wit:

23 MR. JEPSEN: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, Mr.
24 Joyal just asked me how I was going to answer that question
25 of Mr. Doyle's. I hope that I don't have to answer it, but I
26 would be very happy to, if I have to.

1 I want, very briefly, to report action by the Fresno
2 State College faculty in the years 1956 and 1957, at a faculty
3 conference held in Seal Bar each year.

4 I have the minutes of this conference beside me, and in
5 each of those years, 1956 and 1957, the Fresno State College
6 faculty voted unanimously to recommend the creation of a separ-
7 ate State Board for the government of State Colleges.

8 I can only report my own feelings, based upon attendance
9 at these conferences, as to the reason for these resolutions.
10 I believe that the reason was this: We are convinced that
11 divorcement from the State Department of Education is necessary
12 in order to obtain a type of leadership the State Colleges need
13 to face the great educational problems of the future in
14 California.

15 There have been many expressions of these problems and
16 I just very briefly want to express them again in my mind.
17 I think one of the greatest of our problems is how to most
18 effectively spend the necessarily limited amount of money that
19 is going to be available for the great mass of students that
20 we are going to have to educate. What curriculums, in other
21 words, are most important; what type of student is most impor-
22 tant to take advantage of the necessarily limited money?

23 I think another problem is going to be attracting compe-
24 tent faculty members. It is already a bad problem.

25 A third problem, I think, is to be able to convince the
26 State we need more money.

1 In order to tackle these problems most effectively, I
2 think we need leadership of a high order; leaders who are
3 philosophically oriented to the philosophy of higher educa-
4 tion, as has been expressed by my colleagues, and leaders who
5 are expert in utilizing the resources of their body of scholars
6 in order to affect the most efficient and the best policies
7 for higher education in California.

8 That is all I have to say.

9 Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you very much.

11 MR. McELHENEY: Mr. Chairman, from Los Angeles State,
12 Mr. Thompson Black.

13 ---oOo---

14 THOMPSON BLACK,

15 appeared as a witness before the Sub-Committee and testified
16 as follows, to wit:

17 MR. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, my
18 name is Thompson Black. I am Associate Professor of Government
19 at Los Angeles State College and Secretary of the State
20 Council to the ACSCI. I want to make this very brief.

21 I would like to say that I concur in the opinion expres-
22 sed by my colleague, Mr. Misner. I would like to say that I
23 feel this very much. Too much of a variety of jobs that are
24 performed by your State Board, and that the State Colleges are
25 a big problem in themselves.

26 For these reasons, I would like to see a separate Board

1 to administer the State Colleges.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you very much.

4 MR. McELHENEY: Mr. Chairman, from San Fernando Valley
5 State College, we have Jeannie Ellen Fereson.

6 ----oOo----

7 JEANNIE ELLEN FERGESON,

8 appeared as a witness before the Sub-Committee and testified
9 as follows, to wit:

10 MISS FERGESON: I am Jeannie Ellen Fergeson, Assistant
11 Professor of Political Science at the San Fernando Valley
12 State College. I am the representative for CSEA. The member-
13 ship represents 100 percent of the faculty.

14 I can say that we wish to concur with Mr. Misner's
15 report. There is a concensus of opinion that, to develop
16 the type of college we want at San Fernando, we need a separ-
17 ate College Board.

18 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you very much.

19 MR. McELHENEY: Mr. Chairman, from San Diego State, we
20 have Dr. John Spangler.

21 ----oOo----

22 JOHN A. SPANGLER,

23 appeared as a witness before the Sub-Committee and testified
24 as follows, to wit:

25 MR. SPANGLER: Mr. Chairman and members of the Board,
26 my name is John Spangler. I am Professor of Chemistry at San

1 Diego State College and have been here since 1946. I represent
2 the Association of California State College Instructors at
3 San Diego. I am the President at the time, and I wish to in-
4 form the Committee that the general consensus at my College,
5 favors the complete separation of State College control from
6 the Department of Education and Board of Education by the estab-
7 lishment of a separate Board to govern the State Colleges.

8 We endorse completely the report that Dr. Misner pre-
9 sented to you on behalf of the State-wide Association of
10 California State College Instructors.

11 Now, speaking as an individual, if I may, who has attend-
12 ed these hearings the last two days, I have served as Chair-
13 man of the Chemistry at San Diego State for the past three
14 years. We rotate Chairmanship every three years. My term of
15 office ended this past January.

16 I feel that we have a very strong Department of Chemistry
17 at San Diego State. This belief is borne out by the success
18 of our graduates in industry, and further graduate schooling.
19 We have been accredited by the American Chemical Society for
20 the past 10 years. This is the only accrediting agency in
21 chemical education in the Nation. The recognized excellence
22 of this department is an example of the comparable stature of
23 all the departments in all of the California State Colleges.

24 In view of these considerations, I wish to express my
25 shock yesterday at the testimony of Mr. Blair, Chairman of the
26 State Board of Education. His apparent belief that the

1 California State Colleges are simply a four-year extension of
2 the secondary education system in California is absolutely
3 incredible to me.

4 Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Doyle?

6 ASSEMBLYMAN DOYLE: To what do you attribute the differ-
7 ence in opinions between the College Presidents and you people
8 in the colleges?

9 MR. SPANGLER: I am glad you asked me that question be-
10 cause I had intended to try to clarify the apparent discrepan-
11 cy between the cooperation of the faculty and the Presidents.

12 This is my personal opinion: At San Diego State College,
13 we have excellent cooperation on the local level between our
14 President and the faculty. He has what is called a "Liaison
15 Committee" and Presidents of the three principal organizations
16 on the campus, the Association of State College Instructors,
17 the California State Employees' Association and the AAUP.

18 We met with him and exchanged ideas on mutual problems.
19 The difficulty arises from the fact that his hands are tied.
20 He is an employee of the State Department of Education; his
21 appointments are upon a one-year term confirmed by the Board
22 of Education. He has no alternative but to go along with the
23 views expressed by the Department of Education to the Board of
24 Education. He can't tell us, I am sure, exactly how he might
25 feel on these views. This is my personal opinion, as I say.

26 ASSEMBLYMAN DOYLE: Do you happen to know how your Presi-

1 dent feels on this issue? I mean, let me put it this way:
2 Has he ever stated his views to you or your organization?
3 If it is private, you can forget it, but if he stated it pub-
4 licly, can you tell us?

5 MR. SPANGLER: I don't believe that I can. We have talk-
6 ed this over, and it was a private conversation.

7 I am not implying by this that Dr. Love has contrary
8 views. He was here yesterday, and he indicated that he had
9 joined in with the College Presidents in this point of view.

10 ASSEMBLYMAN DOYLE: Well, it isn't with any thought of
11 putting anyone on the spot, but there certainly is a clear
12 cut division of thinking here, and it is a matter of laying
13 everything on the table. This is going to have to be done
14 sooner or later.

15 MR. SPANGLER: Well, I believe that the best approach
16 would be to get each of the State College Presidents to testify
17 as to their personal views on this.

18 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions?

19 (No response.)

20 Thank you very much.

21 MR. McELHENEY: Mr. Chairman, from San Francisco State
22 College comes Dr. Leo McClatchy.

23 ----oOo----

24 LEO McCLATCHY,

25 appeared as a witness before the Sub-Committee and testified
26 as follows, to wit:

1 MR. McCLATCHY: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee,
2 my name is Leo McClatchy. I am an attorney, outgoing President
3 of our local chapter of ACSCI, and member of the Academic
4 Committee of CSEA.

5 I will make my remarks extremely brief. I think the
6 tenor was set a few minutes ago.

7 I would like to say that at our College, on the local
8 level, we have excellent faculty administrative relationships
9 with a great deal of faculty participation in the setting of
10 policy, and this is especially true with our new President.
11 In fact, this fall we are setting up, for the first time, a
12 Faculty Council with elected faculty representatives, who will
13 work with the President, and I know that there will be a great
14 deal of cooperation.

15 We also realize that -- especially those of us who know
16 our other colleagues throughout the other colleges -- that
17 this thinking is not true at all of the other colleges.

18 We also know that at the State level there has been a
19 definite lack of leadership, and we feel that we are suffering
20 because of it and certainly something must be done to give us
21 more effective leadership at the State level.

22 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Anderson.

23 ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: You mean this Council will
24 actually pass on and discuss policy matters?

25 MR. McCLATCHY: If we look at the law through the Educa-
26 tion Code, the faculty of the colleges really have no authority

1 whatsoever with the exception of the authority to approve the
2 final granting of degrees to graduates of institutions.

3 However, this, I don't think, is the important aspect.

4 A President can get and derive a great deal of help from his
5 faculty. After all, we have faculties in all walks of life
6 with all sorts of academic backgrounds, experts in many fields
7 and many of the people should be called upon to assist the
8 President, to assist the Chairman of the Divisions in the for-
9 mulation of educational policy.

10 No, this Faculty Council -- I cannot say -- the Presi-
11 dent could not, under this framework, give us his legal
12 responsibilities. We are an advisory group, but regardless
13 of whether you are an advisory group, I think, or actually a
14 group with power, if you have responsible individuals who work
15 hard on a committee and make intelligent recommendations, I
16 am certain that we will get full cooperation from our President.

17 ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: This statement of Dr. Simpson's
18 that we heard read from the Chronicle a few moments ago, your
19 set-up would not be in conflict with that, then?

20 MR. McCLATCHY: Well, as far as Dr. Simpson is concerned,
21 I think, after all, he is thinking in terms of the State level.
22 After all, if the faculty of any State College makes a recom-
23 mendation to the President -- and we fully recognize that it
24 should even be so -- the President has the responsibility of
25 making the decision, and if it is necessary for a decision to
26 be made at a higher level, for the President to then make the

1 recommendation to the State Superintendent of Public
2 Instruction.

3 I think Dr. Simpson's idea is basically to the State
4 level. Certainly, at present, I personally feel that most of
5 our State College Presidents work very cooperatively with our
6 faculties, but I wouldn't want to mention any names. I know
7 this is not true in some of them.

8 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you very much.

9 MR. McELHENEY: Mr. Chairman, from Sacramento State
10 College, Dr. Leonard Cain.

11 ----oOo----

12 LEONARD CAIN,
13 appeared as a witness before the Sub-Committee and testified
14 as follows, to wit:

15 MR. CAIN: Mr. Chairman, I am Leonard Cain, Assistant
16 Professor of Sociology at Sacramento State. I am here pri-
17 marily representing the local chapter of CSEA, and due to the
18 inability of the CSEA representative, I have been asked to
19 represent Chapter 100 as well.

20 First of all, I would like to report the background and
21 result of a vote taken by our local chapter of CSEA on this
22 matter of local administration in the College System. This
23 matter was discussed in council and it was decided, through a
24 resolution, to request each College Chapter of ACSCI to inves-
25 tigate, to discuss with the faculties and then report back as
26 soon as possible to the State Council President the decisions

1 made.

2 Shortly after my return to the campus, the Executive
3 Committee of ACSCI recommended leading to discuss this, not
4 only the members of ACSCI, but the entire faculty was invited
5 to attend. A sheet, suggesting some "pros" and "cons" of the
6 Separate State Board, some of the possible strength and pos-
7 sible weaknesses, was drawn up and distributed. One hour's
8 discussion was not enough and shortly we had a second meeting.

9 During the second meeting, a motion was made to poll the
10 members of the ACSCI. Three alternatives were presented:
11 Recommendation that we adopt the Restudy Proposal for Separate
12 State Board; two, suggest that there be internal alterations
13 made possibly in personnel, possibly an emphasis on college
14 matters within the State Board, and, lastly, the status quo.

15 The result of that vote was as follows: 46 members
16 voted for the Restudy Proposal; one voted to have internal
17 alterations; one voted status quo. Since that time, the per-
18 son who apparently voted for the status quo has confessed to
19 me and has asked forgiveness.

20 I might mention that there was, at this second meeting,
21 a representative of the State Department of Education, Mr.
22 Monroe. Likewise, I would like to mention -- and this is in
23 regard to the matter of communication between faculty and
24 other agencies -- that this report, the report and tabulation,
25 voting for the "pros" and "cons" in the announcement out of
26 the meeting, were forwarded to the President of Sacramento

1 State College. This, then, is what I can officially report
2 to this Sub-Committee.

3 If I may, I would like to speak very briefly in regard
4 to some of my own thinking. I think this is certainly blended
5 with the thinking of a vast majority of my colleagues. My own
6 thinking is rather directly contrary to that represented by
7 Dr. Simpson's proposal and I think also that represented by the
8 State College Presidents.

9 I think it is not a matter of a goal, of a long-range
10 end. Certainly, the faculties and the administrations of the
11 State Colleges have the improvement of the instruction as the
12 goal.

13 I think it is primarily a matter of priority.

14 In talking about my own College President, in hearing
15 yesterday's testimony before the Board by Dr. Joyal here the
16 other afternoon, I got the impression that we identified the
17 main problem as one of an interdepartmental nature.

18 It is primarily a physical matter. If we can become
19 unshackled from the other administrative agencies, then, we
20 will have freedom; we can have authority; we can assert power,
21 and, therefore, approval.

22 It seems to me that rather than the basic issue being
23 that of physical severance, it is one of philosophical
24 severance. This has already been touched upon and I wouldn't
25 want to elaborate on it, but it is a matter of philosophical
26 nature, rather than physical nature. I would suggest that it

1 is primarily the task of the higher educational function to
2 interpret and contribute to knowledge, rather than to transmit
3 knowledge, which, I gather, is the primary function of the
4 elementary and secondary systems.

5 This task, this privilege of interpreting and contributing
6 creatively to our heritage, to knowledge, is, I think, a dis-
7 tinct task, one that requires special consideration of a
8 Board, an administration that will develop and defend policy
9 quite distinct from that now in evidence in our State level
10 administration.

11 I think that the first priority or priorities should be
12 given to this philosophical severance. It is my hope that
13 through the assertion of leadership of the State Colleges, we
14 will attain autonomy, whether it is a structural autonomy or
15 not, or an operational autonomy from Finance, from Personnel,
16 we will be able to show new leadership through accomplishment
17 that we are deserving.

18 Thank you very much.

19 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: If there are no questions, I wish
20 to thank you very much.

21 MR. McELHENEY: Mr. Chairman, from Long Beach State
22 College, Dr. George Appleton.

23 ---oOo---

24 GEORGE APPLETON,

25 appeared as a witness before the Sub-Committee and testified
26 as follows, to wit:

1 MR. APPLETON: I am George Appleton, Associate Professor
2 of Physics, Long Beach State College.

3 This year I came out of the laboratory in the ivory
4 tower in which I usually like to keep myself and was elected
5 Representative of the ACSCI Chapter No. 10.

6 We have discussed this issue very vigorously on our
7 campus, and our faculty is 90 percent in favor of the divorce
8 entirely from the State Body of Education by establishment of
9 a State Board.

10 There have been a lot of reasons pointed out why this
11 would be a good thing. I am sorry I came so late in the day;
12 I have a new one. I would like to point it out briefly.

13 We have talked a lot about the crises in education. I
14 am sorry to say that when I have come to the meetings, as I
15 have in the past year, we seem to be so burdened with some of
16 the administrative details in the role of Finance and in the
17 role of the State Personnel Board and the State Board of
18 Education, they have their study and that study is the bare,
19 dead bones of statistics. There is none of the vitality that
20 I see in the classroom.

21 It is a tremendous gulf to bridge. This is why partici-
22 pation is necessary. We do the jobs, we teach the students,
23 not the administrators; we have a feeling of what should be
24 done; we have the tradition of Western Civilization behind us,
25 and we want to carry it on.

26 Now, when I say things like that, I am usually given the

1 reputation of a 24-carat egghead, but this is the job and
2 this is the kind of people I represent at the College.

3 Now, we have on the campus, in our administration, a
4 philosophy of education which is primarily a public school
5 philosophy. I don't disparage it; it has its illustrious
6 history. I think it has failed in a lot of respects today.
7 They are in conflict; not because they like it; not because I
8 enjoy an acrimonious relationship with my President, but because
9 we react to circumstances by the fundamental belief that we
10 both have.

11 I think the separation of a State Board will immediately
12 help in the solution of this, in some respects, because we
13 would be divorced from the State Department of Education, and
14 we have cut the umbilical cord that ties us to our formal
15 school past. We question, with this State Board, the concept
16 of faculty participation definitely established by that State
17 Board as a policy of education in the State Colleges.

18 Then, the faculty of many schools will be unleashed and
19 they will be able to debate and discuss on equality, not spout
20 about the administration. Through this work, the new philo-
21 sophy of education can be developed to meet the needs, not
22 only of the State Colleges of California, but also to help in
23 terms of public higher education elsewhere.

24 We want to participate there. We academic people may
25 be very strange to you; we want responsibilities but we shun
26 authority. This is a matter of our tradition. This is the way

1 we like it. It is rather hard to explain to someone outside,
2 but I would like us to have the chance. I would like us to
3 have the opportunity on our campus to be able to debate these
4 matters and be able to talk seriously about them so that our
5 points can come across.

6 That is about all I have to say.

7 Thank you, gentlemen.

8 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you very much.

9 MR. McELHENEY: That concludes our presentation, Mr.
10 Chairman. Thank you very much.

11 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Now, we have had to jump around
12 considerably on the agenda, and I don't know whether we have
13 overlooked anyone that wants to testify or not, but if there
14 is anyone here who would like to testify, we certainly want
15 to hear them. We don't want to adjourn this meeting before
16 everyone has an opportunity that wishes to testify.

17 ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Mr. Chairman, since several of the
18 gentlemen that wanted to go on record as to an observation in
19 regard to this subject, I would like to make just a short one
20 for the Committee and those who have been to, I think, great
21 service to this Committee in these particulars that they have
22 brought us on all sides of this problem.

23 What I have to say is fairly close to what the last
24 speaker has said. I am looking back at my academic background
25 and can think of only one achievement that would make me stand
26 out, and that is: I think at UCLA I was -- at the time I

1 was there -- the only philosophy major that was ever on the
2 wrestling team.

3 I am very much impressed at this hearing that there is
4 an indication that we need a fresh expression of the philo-
5 sophy of education on it's level. That is, we should reflect
6 what we have become, rather than what we once were. A clear,
7 understandable and acceptable statement of what we are seeking
8 to achieve in each of our educational institutions by our
9 educational activity -- without such a framework of reference,
10 change is dangerous, plans are apt to be small and visions
11 restricted.

12 We inevitably, in effecting change, do not leave behind
13 all the devils that we know and inescapably we meet devils
14 whose acquaintances we have so far happily escaped. I think
15 we can expect that no matter what changes we make, some of the
16 particular problems that have been enunciated here today will
17 reappear in the new form of organization. The answers suggest-
18 ed to their solution will, in another time and another place,
19 take another form.

20 I think that all of us must realize in living in a
21 changing world that we never come to a complete solution of
22 any of our problems, but I should hope that in answering this
23 problem in the field of education, this Committee and all of
24 you who have been so gracious as to put your time and energy
25 and talents into developing what we have here developed, will
26 keep in focus the great calling that we have in education, and

1 the need that we have to raise the dignity of everybody that
2 is involved in it, from the humble kindergarten school teacher
3 to the highest professorial ranks that we would have in our
4 universities and colleges.

5 I think that so long as we do these things and do them
6 with a reference to a frame-work of a philosophy that we all
7 understand and, to at least a great degree accept, we will
8 resolve our differences and do the finest possible job for the
9 State of California.

10 That is all I have to say.

11 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: All right. I believe there is a
12 Mr. DeVilbis here from San Jose.

13 ---oOo---

14 E. J. DE VILBISS,

15 appeared as a witness before the Sub-Committee and testified
16 as follows, to wit:

17 MR. DE VILBISS: When I came in this morning, I had a
18 lot of ideas, and I was going to express a lot of viewpoints,
19 and I find that most of them have been expressed.

20 I am not speaking for the alumni as a whole, the Alumni
21 Board holds no meetings during the summertime. This problem
22 has been discussed from time to time and I think, by and
23 large, I and our group are in favor of the principle of the
24 separate Board for the State Colleges. We both look at the
25 proposal of Dr. Simpson as being the most minimal step, prob-
26 ably from this point of view, required to solve the problem

1 and solve the pressure that is developing and has been expres-
2 sed by all of the faculty members, and all the problems
3 involved.

4 Mr. Doyle mentioned this morning that we don't want
5 half a loaf, we want a whole loaf. My view would be that the
6 proposal outlined by Dr. Simpson and his group is not even
7 half a loaf; it is not even part of a loaf; it is just the
8 most minimal possible step, it seems to me, that could be taken
9 at all. We would strongly support the feeling and the view
10 points expressed by the faculty members that the basic issue
11 here is one of philosophy of education, whether or not this
12 should be separated from the philosophy of the elementary and
13 the high school education.

14 In my own view, it should. I think if you look at the
15 State College enrollment projection up to 1966, it will show
16 that there will be 40,000 more students in the State College
17 System than there will be in the University of California.

18 I think this cries out, showing the pressures and the
19 needs, and the State College System has to be more responsive
20 to the needs, the educational needs of the various communities.
21 This is my private viewpoint.

22 I am the manager of a civic organization, San Francisco
23 County Taxpayers' Organization. This brings me into rather
24 first hand contact with elementary schools and high schools.
25 I appear before boards of the schools and of junior colleges.
26 We have two junior colleges in Santa Clara County. We have

1 one that used to be combined with San Jose State College
2 that is operating by the San Jose Unified School District.
3 We have another one that has just been formed in the northern
4 part of Santa Clara County. This is called the "Foothills
5 Junior College".

6 Now, in dealing with the schools and the high schools
7 and the junior colleges, the thing that strikes me about them
8 is their responsiveness to the educational needs and the
9 demands of the community. All these schools operate within
10 the frame-work of the State laws, State policies established
11 by the State Board of Education in our Codes, and yet, they
12 have one other thing that the State College System does not
13 have, and it seems to me every system.

14 The University of California, through it's Board of
15 Regents, and all these local schools I mentioned, they all
16 have this one thing that the State College System does not
17 have and that is, someone who has an interest, an undivided
18 interest.

19 People serve on these local boards because they are
20 interested. They want to serve their elementary, high school
21 or junior colleges. The same would be true, but the Board of
22 Regents does not have this undivided interest to the State
23 College System, nor does it have an undivided loyalty.

24 You can see in the case of the new college districts
25 that were formed in this past year and a half, a body of
26 trustees; very capable men are elected. They have a bond issue

1 \$12,000,000 passed four to one, and they are now buying two
2 campus sites that, within a period of two years, will be a
3 full-fledged school there underway.

4 They have responsiveness to the people and they can meet
5 the needs. I think the only way to achieve it is to have a
6 group pushing for the field of higher education and that is
7 one of the reasons I would point out and advocate a separate
8 Board.

9 Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you very much for your testi-
11 mony.

12 Now, is there anyone else in the audience that would
13 like to testify?

14 MR. JEPSEN: Mr. Chairman, my name is Victor Jepsen.
15 I talked before, but as the Vice-President of the Association
16 of California State College Instructors, I would like, at this
17 time, to express my appreciation to the Committee for giving
18 us this opportunity to testify. We certainly appreciate it
19 very much.

20 Milo Rowe, from Fresno, wishes to testify.

21 ---oOo---

22 MILO ROWE,
23 appeared as a witness before the Sub-Committee and testified
24 as follows, to wit:

25 MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I
26 feel either lonesome or flattered. I do not happen to be

1 connected in any way, directly or indirectly, with any educa-
2 tional institution, and, as a result, perhaps I should be more
3 timid than to appear before you.

4 There are one or two things that I would like to direct
5 to your attention, and in doing so, if I may introduce myself
6 a little bit, perhaps it will lend a little substance to what
7 I may say.

8 I happen to be a lawyer in this community and have prac-
9 ticed for some 32 years. In my training for the law, I was
10 equally interested in political science and probably studied
11 that with as much enthusiasm as I did the law, and I suppose
12 that was somewhat from family training and encouragement.

13 After graduating from college, I practiced here in
14 Fresno. I became interested in all civic affairs -- and I
15 guess that is a tendency of lawyers -- and have probably par-
16 ticipated in all the normal civic affairs that anybody does
17 in a normal community; Boy Scouts and the United Givers and
18 everything of that sort, and probably the culmination of
19 City Boards and everything of that sort. The culmination of
20 that activity was as President of the California Taxpayers'
21 Association, in which I finished my term of office about two
22 years ago.

23 Along with most of the rest of the United States, I
24 happened to serve in the Armed Forces, and I was quite
25 fortunate -- and I bring this up because I think it has perti-
26 nency in regard to the matter of political science -- while

1 serving in that capacity, I had the opportunity to write the
2 Constitution of Japan and they have managed to survive under
3 that for about 12 years. I guess it was a satisfactory
4 political document.

5 There are some things that have occurred here today
6 which I feel have not been investigated. First, to get back
7 to the taxpayers' angle on this situation, I am sure you all
8 appreciate the fact that we can reasonably anticipate having
9 more than three times as many students in the University of
10 California and the State Colleges attending our schools by
11 1970, or, probably, several years before that.

12 You, as legislators, are going to have the very unhappy
13 burden of distributing what little is going to be available
14 for education amongst three times as many people as you are
15 now distributing. Whether there is going to be three times
16 as much money to do this or not is going to be a very severe
17 question. If these computations of the future are correct,
18 whereas currently the State Colleges are now educating
19 slightly more than the University of California System is edu-
20 cating, by that time, they will be educating at least 50 per-
21 cent more students than the University of California will
22 then be educating.

23 Certainly that institution of State Colleges is going
24 to be one of the utmost importance to the State of California
25 in it's education by that time. In 12 years, you know that
26 we are going to have a great deal -- that the time is going to

1 be here before we know it.

2 Perhaps I should go back and give a little more back-
3 ground on one of the other significant things that I have
4 become interested in lately, that is, that the University of
5 California has indicated that they are planning to establish
6 a campus somewhere in the San Joaquin Valley, somewhere in
7 1970. I am most proud and most happy with the development of
8 the wonderful Fresno State College that we have here now. I
9 think it is a credit to the State College System and I think
10 any system under which an institution of that quality can
11 develop is not a poor system. It must have considerable merit
12 to be able to create an institution such as this.

13 On the other hand, it is going through growing pains,
14 and we expect, by 1970, that this institution is going to be
15 overcrowded and that probably the prognostication that a
16 University Branch in the Valley someplace is going to be re-
17 quired is correct.

18 Based on that assumption, I asked a member of this city
19 and this community, who has been urging the University to look
20 with favor on Fresno as a place to establish a branch at that
21 time, and because of that I have gotten into the problem that
22 the people of the University of California are facing, as well
23 as the taxpayer's standpoint.

24 I think, certainly, that any institution, such as the
25 State College institution that is going to be educating some
26 50 percent more than the University of California is educating

1 is entitled to equal amount of independence.

2 Therefore, a Board of whatever you want to call them
3 devoted solely to those problems is essential.

4 I feel also that if you are going to do that, you also
5 have to solve the problems of the junior colleges because
6 they, likewise, are a very important segment of higher educa-
7 tion in the State of California. If you, as legislators, are
8 going to be placed in the position where you are going to have
9 to distribute the funds of the State between all of the various
10 institutions, each working for himself, you are going to put a
11 very severe administrative burden on the Legislative Branch of
12 the community.

13 Now, how are you going to solve that one? I am not going
14 to suggest because that is beyond my provision, but I do know
15 that education, as a whole, should be able to present to the
16 Legislature, for it's activity as legislators, the legislative
17 problems and solve their own internal problems before it comes
18 to you, at least in one part.

19 I don't want to detract in any manner from my recommenda-
20 tion of a separate organization being established for the
21 State College System. I think it has grown up and deserves it
22 and has earned it. In the future, it is going to need it a
23 great deal more than it does today.

24 On the other hand, you, I think, are just at the beginning
25 of the problem if you do create such an institution. Then, the
26 Legislature is going to have to create some coordinating

1 organization that will assist the Legislature when it comes
2 to deciding what funds are going to be available for some
3 20 to 25,000 students who are going to be attending State
4 Colleges and Universities in just a few short years.

5 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you very much for your
6 testimony.

7 Is there anyone else in the audience that would like
8 to testify?

9 (No response.)

10 Is there anyone from the Committee that has any further
11 remarks?

12 ASSEMBLYMAN DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, as Chairman of the
13 Overall Committee, I would like to commend you and the members
14 of this Committee for what I think has been an excellent job
15 in setting up the meeting, including our associate, Mr. Mar-
16 shall, and Miss Ley over there.

17 I feel that something good will come out of this meeting
18 and that the College Presidents and the professors, as the
19 gentleman said, those who run the colleges, those on the various
20 committees, are going to be expressing their views between now
21 and January. When that legislation is introduced, I am sure
22 that all of the members of this Committee will be back in
23 Sacramento at that time and certainly will be happy to sit down
24 with this group and work it out.

25 Whatever you decide on, I am sure, will be for the best
26 interests of the students that are going to be educated in

1 our State Colleges.

2 That is all I have to say.

3 CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: I want to thank Dr. Joyal and his
4 members of the college faculty who have made it so pleasant
5 for us here during our two-day hearing.

6 I want to thank all of the people that have been here as
7 witnesses and those who have been here as interested citizens.
8 I assure you that this Committee will have an executive meeting
9 and deliberate on the testimony we have heard and review the
10 testimony before we make any recommendations to the Education
11 Committee, of which Mr. Doyle is Chairman.

12 I want to thank the staff members and the young lady
13 here, who has worked so diligently, and I hope that sometime we
14 will be able to come back to Fresno for another hearing on
15 another subject.

16 Thank you very much.

17 (Whereupon, at the hour of 4:30 o'clock p.m., the hearing
18 of the Assembly Interim Committee on Education of the Califor-
19 nia Legislature was adjourned, same day and date.)

20 ---oOo---

21

22

23

24

25

26

1 IT HAS BEEN REQUESTED THAT THE FOLLOWING WRITTEN STATEMENTS
2 BE PLACED IN THE RECORD.

3 ---oOo---

4 STATEMENT BY RICHARD H. WILDER

5 LONG BEACH STATE COLLEGE

6
7 The faculty of Long Beach State College strongly concurs
8 in the statement of ACSCI and CSEA, concerning the need for
9 a separate State College Board and in the need for separation
10 from the administrative control of the State Department of
11 Education.

12 The issue is one of educational philosophy and span of
13 control. An effective Board, which can provide leadership in
14 higher education, is not possible under a single Board charged
15 with the vast supervisory functions over the entire Public
16 School System, as well as with the government of the State
17 Colleges.

18 We do feel also that faculty voice should be heard
19 (among other voices) in the policy formulation process for the
20 State Colleges. Our experience is that Dr. Simpson and the
21 philosophy of the State Department of Education is opposed to
22 such faculty participation.

23 ---oOo---

---oOo---

STATEMENT BY GEORGE W. KORBERLONG BEACH STATE COLLEGE

As President of our local Chapter of ACSCI, I came to this meeting to work for a separate State Board for State Colleges, completely divorced from the State Department of Education.

Going beyond my mandate from our faculty, however, it is my personal belief that we are now confronted by a dilemma: We can have either limited higher education at a price we can afford to pay, or we can have unlimited, mediocre education at a price we cannot afford to pay, through our State College System.

I believe the prevailing policy of the present State Board and State Department of Education lead inevitably to the second of these two alternatives. In my judgment, we cannot afford mass college education in terms of either it's financial or intellectual consequences.

Emphasizing quality rather than quantity in higher education is the answer to both of these undesirable possibilities.

---oOo---

---oOo---

STATEMENT OF V. A. METZGER

LONG BEACH STATE COLLEGE

The fundamental problem facing the State of California re higher education is: What quality and quantity of such education can be effectively and economically offered?

Currently 40 percent of the State Budget is used for education. The population is increasing and real financial pressures are already present. The public schools are already committed to educating 100 percent of students through the 12th year. The University of California is striving to serve the top 12 percent of our high school graduates with a 1 to 12 faculty ratio, along with improved instruction and research.

The State Colleges of California are without leadership and direction to resolve their problems and establish policy and major plans to serve and match population trends, student characteristics and needs, programs, effective higher education and public finance.

The above problems, in terms of both their magnitude and dynamic complexities, will probably even overload a separate State College Board and staff. I propose a separate State College Board and staff to give economical and needed leadership to the State Colleges.

---oOo---

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that I, MARY LYNN LEY, an Official Shorthand Reporter, was present at the time and place the foregoing proceedings were had and taken; that I did write the same in Stenotypy; that I afterwards transcribed my said Stenotypy into typewriting; that the foregoing pages, beginning at the top of page 1 to and including line 23 of page 315 hereof, constitute a full, true, complete and correct transcription thereof.

Dated this ____ day of September, 1958.

MARY LYNN LEY
Official Shorthand Reporter